Labor Movements and Labor Problems in America

LABOR AND THE COMMON WELFARE

SAMUEL GOMPERS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 15 1920
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division HD8072
Section .G63

LABOR AND THE COMMON WELFARE

LABOR AND THE COMMON WELFARE

P31

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 15 1920
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY
SAMUEL GOMPERS
PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR;
VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION

COMPILED AND EDITED BY
HAYES ROBBINS

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY
681 FIFTH AVENUE

COPYRIGHT, 1919,
BY E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY

All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

199

FOREWORD

The men and women who work for wages will largely shape the fortunes of America during the next generation. No other one fact stands out so sharply in the aftermath of the world war. According to the point of view, it is an outlook of menace or of confidence. There is apprehension in many minds that this vast emergence of labor, like the rising of a new continent out of the sea, means the sinking of civilization all about it under a wave of revolution and anarchy. On the other hand, there is a growing perception among people who think carefully and see far, that there are foundations under this new continent, that tremendous stabilizing forces have been at work. Perhaps we have only half believed that the welfare of mankind really is most secure when the pyramid rests broadly upon its base instead of balancing on its apex; that the safest thing in human society, ultimately the only thing that is safe, is freedom, under the self-control of democracy.

The growth of just this saving power of self-control, right in heart of the labor problem itself, is what most reassures those who see the future of democracy mainly as an industrial issue. That the trade union has been and is a great training school in every-day working democracy, whatever else may be said of it, is at last dawning on the general consciousness. Through a hundred years of fierce controversy, against the bitter hostility of most of the community instead of with its help, workingmen have been learning in their own way the one thing which in 1919, this crucial day of reconstruction, has come to stand between civilization and anarchy—the settled habit of self-government.

Especially in the last generation the labor movement in America has proved to itself, as to the whole body politic, that a vast betterment in working and living conditions is actually possible through the orderly processes of self-help and free association, with no necessity of wrecking the economic and political system

under which our common problems are working out. These men of the forge and the loom and the mine and the rail, whom so many in their wisdom have insisted must be helped up out of ignorance and taught the laws of economics and the "natural limits" of working-class progress, have themselves taught us how to make the industrial and wage system meet the universal demand for a rising standard of life. And in doing that they have shown us, in the really fundamental sense, how to make the world safe for democracy.

For this supreme demonstration America is indebted, more than to any other one force, to the industrial statesmanship of Samuel Gompers. The term itself has come into men's minds instinctively in the effort to characterize Mr. Gompers' philosophy and life work. It is as the world's first industrial statesman that he has made and is making his impress upon his time. In the modern world, the right appraisal of new forces is swift; it no longer requires a century to estimate unerringly either great invention, great art or great leadership.

In the critical years just ahead, men of affairs in the business world, in the labor movement, in public life, young men and women in the schools and colleges, sincere idealists in every group, will need the inspiration and guidance of broadly constructive ideas, grounded upon reasoned experience. The world convulsion has sent a wave of emotionalism over public sentiment. With its recession will come the settling down to actual decisions, the slow and painful finding of workable solutions in a complex of actual men and women as they are. It will not be a mental exercise in designing new worlds. But the issues and adjustments that face us and will face us are not new. They have taken on new edge and urgency, but in all essentials they are the same that have been fought out in our industrial relations and the clash of social theories for more than a generation—almost the exact period, in fact, of the rise of labor organization in America and of Mr. Gompers' manifold activities.

In all this tremendous broadening of the base of the pyramid, all this hard fought struggle away from old and narrow conceptions of democracy, all the re-application of old truths to new and unforeseen conditions, no other man has continuously played so active and influential a part, so humanly constructive, so high in educational meaning to the workers and nation builders of

the next generation. Thirty years ago our national development was still mainly a problem of science, of invention, of industrial organization. From now one we have the more far-reaching, more searching and critical task of so shaping our industrial life that all the human elements within it share justly in the net results and are thereby enabled to work together in the spirit of co-operation and mutual respect.

Very few, even of those whose sympathies lie with organized labor, comprehend what it means to be freely accorded and to hold the post of guidance in this "freest democracy in the world." Here, if nowhere else in our social organization, every step must be taken in broad daylight, every motive is under scrutiny, every grant of power is under recall, every policy must win on its merits in the fire of debate which, if not always brutal, is certainly never less than frank. To have maintained a firm leadership in such a movement for almost forty years, grappling at first hand with the ugliest front of every big and little issue of labor concern, guiding an all but outlawed group of a few hundred unpopular "agitators" to a powerful and respected self-governing body of nearly four million men and women of every race, language, trade and condition, is an achievement without precedent in the history of working-class movements in any country or any time.

It goes without argument that a creative work of such proportions, particularly its underlying philosophy, deserves careful and unprejudiced study. Mr. Gompers' ideas and practical counsel on a wide range of topics, as grouped for the first time in these volumes, reveal from the beginning an extraordinary singleness of aim, consistency of logic and tenacious hold on fundamental principles through this entire period of swift and changing currents in our national life. The educational value of so unique an experience, interpreted in the ripened thought of the man himself, will become clearer in the parting of the ways just ahead.

Thus far there has been no satisfactory means of conveying Mr. Gompers' message as a logical whole, in orderly relation to the problems on which most men are groping in the dark. It is believed that the difficulty is met to a large extent in the selections from his writings and addresses of the last thirty-five years, grouped respectively in the volumes "Labor and the Common Welfare" and "Labor and the Employer." As the titles suggest, the first discusses certain broad general phases of the labor prob-

lem in its relation to the life of the community as a whole; the second will deal with more specific issues and facts of every-day working relations, including the history, aims and achievements of the American Federation of Labor, its contact with various employers' associations, the questions of wages and hours, of the so-called open shop and union shop, of child labor, women in industry, unemployment, insurance, compensation, strikes, lockouts, boycotts and blacklisting, mediation, arbitration and collective bargaining, the labor view of profit-sharing, coöperation, efficiency systems, and of the true democratization of industry.

To crystallize in this way the intellectual output of a lifetime necessarily sacrifices much of value in the full discussion of questions from which only the net conclusions can be drawn. The gain lies in the focusing of Mr. Gompers' best thought upon many of the problems a hard-pressed public opinion must solve almost in the moment it attempts to study them. Even the selections from earlier years bear upon matters still very much with us, and hold as well a definite historic interest of their own in marking from point to point the position organized labor has taken on significant issues of universal concern. Particularly, they reveal the development of Mr. Gompers' philosophy to the level of sure leadership and intellectual force which proved in the hour of supreme peril the chief factors in labor's firm resistance to subtle propaganda, its tremendous and decisive massing on the side of civilization. Here industrial statesmanship rose to world vision, saw the opportunity of the centuries to rid the world's burden bearers of autocracy and militarism, and did not flinch from all it would cost to do it.

HAYES ROBBINS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	THE PHILOSOPHY OF TRADE UNIONISM	1
II.	LABOR AND THE COMMUNITY	23
	Labor and Public Opinion	23
	"Friends of Labor," Philanthropic and Doctrinaire	29
	The National Civic Federation	36
	Labor and the Farmer	40
	Labor and Good Citizenship	42
III.	LABOR AND THE LAW	45
	Government and Legislation	45
	Rights and Liberties	57
	The Courts and Labor Injunctions	61
IV.	LABOR'S STAND ON PUBLIC ISSUES	78
	Immigration	78
	The Trusts and Labor	89
	Control of Capital and Finance	93
	Government Ownership	95
	Industrial Education	101
	Woman Suffrage	107
	Free Speech and Public Assembly	108
	Convict Labor and Prison Reform	110
	Health and Sanitation	115
	Conservation of Resources	121
V.	THE POLITICAL POLICY OF ORGANIZED LABOR	123
VI.	LABOR'S PLACE IN MODERN PROGRESS	147
VII.	ORGANIZED LABOR'S CHALLENGE TO SOCIALISM AND REVOLUTION	175
	Socialism and Socialist Tactics	175
	The I. W. W., and "One Big Union"	196
	Bolshevism	206
VIII.	LABOR IN THE WAR FOR DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY	211
	Patriotism, True and False	211
	Labor's Bond of Fraternalism	218
	Twenty Years Ago	223
	Pacifism and Internationalism	225
	Preparedness—not Militarism	239
	When the War Came	247
	Through the Heat and Burden	253
	The League of Nations	270
	Peace and Reconstruction	277

LABOR AND THE COMMON WELFARE

The Author is indebted to George H. Doran Company, publishers of his volume entitled American Labor and the War *for permission to reprint here numerous quotations from his speeches on labor problems, delivered during the war.*

LABOR AND THE COMMON WELFARE

I

THE PHILOSOPHY OF TRADE UNIONISM

Modern industry evolves these organizations [trade unions] out of the existing conditions. . . . Trade unions are not barbarous, nor are they the outgrowth of barbarism. On the contrary they are only possible where civilization exists. . . . In semi-barbarous countries they can hardly exist, if indeed they can exist at all. But they have been formed successfully in this country, in Germany, in England, and they are gradually gaining strength in France. In Great Britain they are very strong; they have been formed there for fifty years, and they are still forming, and I think there is a great future for them yet in America. Wherever trades unions are most firmly organized, there are the rights of the people most respected. A people may be educated, but to me it appears that the greatest amount of intelligence exists in that country or that State where the people are best able to defend their rights and their liberties as against those who are desirous of undermining them. Trade unions are organizations that instil into men a higher motive-power and give them a higher goal to look to. The hope that is too frequently deadened in their breasts when unorganized is awakened by the trades unions as it can be by nothing else.

From testimony before United States Senate committee upon the Relations between Capital and Labor (Henry W. Blair, chairman), August 18, 1883.

Wherever the working people have manifested their desire for improvement by organization, there improvement has taken

place. Wherever the working people are the poorest, most degraded and miserable, there we find the greatest lack of organization; and in the same degree as the basis of the organization is improved, we see the greater improvement in the material, moral and social condition of the people. There are some who believe it is necessary that the condition of the people shall become worse in order to move them to action, to bring about the best results. How far from the truth, how illogical this proposition is can be easily seen when we follow it out to its legitimate conclusion. If the poverty of the working people of the world was the factor that moved them to action and more prosperous conditions, China ought to be at the head of civilization. On the contrary we see that it is through the gradual process of evolution, the improved habits and customs, that there is instilled into the minds of the people a recognition of the wrongs from which they suffer. The more the improved conditions prevail, the greater discontent with any wrongs that may exist. It is only through the enlightenment begotten from material prosperity that mental advancement becomes possible. —*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., December 11-15, 1888.*

Of all the struggles of the human family for freedom, order and progress, the trade unions are the direct and legitimate heirs and successors. It is their mission to continue the battle for the right until the term rights shall lose its relative significance by the abolition of injustice and wrongs. . . . To protect the innocent and young, to raise man and woman from the sloughs of poverty and despair to a proper appreciation of their rights and duties is worthy of our best efforts, our highest aspirations and our noblest impulses.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Boston, Mass., December 11, 1889.*

There are those who, failing to comprehend the economic, political and social tendencies of the trade union movement, regard it as entirely "too slow," "too conservative," and desire to hurl it headlong into a path which, while struggling and hoping for the end, will leave us stranded and losing the practical and beneficial results of our efforts. I maintain that the working people are in too great a need of immediate improvements in

their condition to allow them to forego them in the endeavor to devote their entire energies to an idealistic end however beautiful to contemplate. I maintain further, that the achievement of present practical improvements for the toilers places them on so much vantage ground gained and renders them more capable to deal with the various problems it is their mission to solve. In the language of that foremost of economic and social thinkers, Ira Steward, "The way out of the wage system is through higher wages, resultant only from shorter hours. . . ."

It has been charged that I am trying to drive the socialists out of the movement, that I am intolerant of others' opinions. I desire to take this opportunity of saying that I have ever held that the trade unions are broad enough and liberal enough to admit of any and all shades of thought upon the economic and social question; but at the same time the conviction is deeply rooted in me that in the trade union movement the first condition requisite is good-standing membership in a trade union, regardless of to which party a man might belong.

Those who have had any experience in the labor movement will admit the great work and forbearance, tact and judgment requisite to maintain harmony in organization. The trade unions are no exception to this rule. In the trade union movement I have ever endeavored to attain that much-desired end, and recognize that that in itself is of a sufficiently important nature and requirement as to preclude the possibility of jointly acting with organizations based upon different practical workings or policy.

I am willing to subordinate my opinions to the well being, harmony and success of the labor movement; I am willing to sacrifice myself also in the furtherance of any action it may take for its advancement; I am willing to step aside if that will promote our cause, but I can not and will not prove false to my convictions that the trade unions pure and simple are the natural organizations of the wage-workers to secure their present material and practical improvement and to achieve their final emancipation.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Detroit, Mich., December, 1890.*

In the fourteenth century all organizations of workmen were prohibited as "conspiracies." In fact, less than a hundred years ago, until 1795, no workman could legally travel in search of

employment out of his own parish. But restrictive laws and enactments to fix wages always end in failure. The day had passed when toilers could patiently submit. As W. T. Thornton tersely says: "Men are seldom collected together in large masses without speedily discovering that union is strength; and men whose daily avocation obliged them to be constantly using, and by use to be constantly sharpening their wits, were not likely to be backward in making this discovery." As a result of this determined opposition of the British workmen, trade unions are now legal societies there, with due protection given to their funds, thus becoming constitutionally incorporated as institutions of that country.—*From address before the American Social Science Congress, September 2, 1891.*

We can make of the trade unions exactly what the intelligence and progress of our members will permit. These organizations are of the most elastic character, and whatever action is agreed upon by the organized wage-earning masses can be formulated and achieved by and through the trade unions. It is expected that the leaders of the movement must exercise their best judgment. To artificially and prematurely expand the scope of the organizations is to encounter the danger that the whole fabric may be rent asunder and thus leave all in a plight of misery and despair.—*From Annual Report of A. F. of L. Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., December 12-17, 1892.*

Another impediment to the establishment of correct industrial relations has resulted from the vicious interference of the political economists with their unscientific analogy between commercial commodities and human labor. The falsity of their analogy was exposed in 1850 by a Parisian workman who was being examined before a commission appointed by the French government to inquire into the condition of the working people. One of the commissioners took occasion to impress upon the witness that labor was merely a merchandise. The workman replied, "If merchandise is not sold at one certain time it can be sold at another, while if I do not sell my labor it is lost for all the world as well as myself; and as society lives only upon the results of labor, society is poorer to the whole extent of that

which I have failed to produce."—*From address at International Labor Congress, Chicago, Ill., September, 1893.*

You can not weigh a human soul in the same scales with a piece of pork. You cannot weigh the heart and soul of a child with the same scales upon which you weigh any commodity.

"For this we hold the species human
"Excels in value webs of cotton,
"Or all the gold by wealth begotten."

From address Logansport, Indiana, February 11, 1891.

To-day we find it just as necessary to defend the faith that is within us that the trade union is the natural and legitimate organization of the working classes as at any time since their first organization. Nor need this cause surprise. As a rule the trade unions have no platform of principles declaratory of purposes to which the flights of the imagination often soar, but which so frequently, but simply, appeal to the passionate, the nervous, or the sentimental. The trade unions are the business organizations of the wage-earners, to attend to the business of the wage-earners; and while the earnest, honest, thinking trade unionists must necessarily be sentimental, theoretical, self-sacrificing, and brave, these if needs be they must sink for a time in order that the best interests of the wage-earners may be advanced. Even if but to gain a milestone on the thorny road of emancipation.

The trade unions have the serious work of labor's difficulties to deal with. They must contend for the toiler's rights and against the toiler's wrongs of to-day; to take up the gauntlet when it is thrown down to us; to throw it down in earnest battle to save the lives of our young and innocent children; to rescue them from the factories and work-shops where their bones and sinews are freely coined into dollars of the soundest kind; to place them in the play-ground and school-room, to make the labor of man so remunerative that it will enable the bread-winner to maintain his loved ones as becomes a man and citizen; to wrest from the profit mongers of all kinds the greatest monopoly on earth, the monopoly of the worker's time; to secure for the toilers, relief from the long hours of burdensome toil, and find work for those who can not find work at all, to fight for full enfranchise-

ment of labor, not only at the polls, in the halls of legislation, but far more important than all these, in the factory, work-shop, mill, mine, or field.

These are some of the questions that the trade unions have daily confronting them; winning battles and securing concessions here and there, sometimes a struggle lost, yet ever keeping up the contest until victory is fully and finally achieved. No wonder that the trade unions have little time and care less for declarations of principles, which though high-sounding phrases mean little, fade away and leave the workers demoralized and desperate, with hopes deferred and destroyed, indeed, too often made their hearts sad.

At best the struggles of labor, the obstacles in the path of progress of the working-class are severe enough, without their being continually called upon not only to defend the knowledge of and the faith in our organizations against the antagonism of pelf, avarice, and greed, but also to defend them against covert attack from pretended friends of our organizations and our movement. No wonder that the trade unions with these ever recurring struggles and contentions ever commanding their attention are more concerned in deeds than words, achievements than promises, practical results than theories.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, December, 1896.*

The trade unions are the legitimate outgrowth of modern societary and industrial conditions. They are not the creation of any man's brain. They are organizations of necessity. They were born of the necessity of the workers to protect and defend themselves from encroachment, injustice and wrong. They are the organizations of the working class, for the working class, by the working class; grappling with economic and social problems as they arise, dealing with them in a practical manner to the end that a solution commensurate with the interests of all may be attained.

From hand labor in the home to machine and factory labor witnessed the transition from the trade guilds to the trade unions; with the concentration of wealth and the development of industry, the growth from the local to the national and the international unions, and the closer affiliation of all in a broad and comprehensive federation.

There are some who, dissatisfied with what they term the slow progress of the labor movement, would have us hasten it by what they lead themselves to believe is a shorter route. No intelligent workman who has passed years of his life in the study of the labor problem, expects to wake up any fine morning to find the hopes of these years realized over night, and the world on the flood-tide of the millennium. With the knowledge that the past tells us of the slow progress of the ages, of trial and travail, mistakes and doubts yet unsolved; with the history of the working class bedewed with the tears of a thousand generations and tinged with the life-blood of numberless martyrs, the trade unionist is not likely to stake his future hopes on the fond chance of the many millions turning philosophers in the twinkling of an eye.

Much of our misery as enforced wage-workers springs, not so much from any power exerted by the "upper" or ruling class, as it is the result of the ignorance of so many in our own class who accept conditions by their own volition. The more intelligent, realizing their inability to *create* a millennium, will not descend to trickery or juggling with terms. They seek to benefit themselves and their fellow men through trade unions and trade union action, and, by bearing the brunt, be in the vanguard in the cause, and hasten on the process of education that will fit humanity even to recognize the millennium when it arrives.

Each "ism" has stood but as an evanescent and iridescent dream of poor humanity groping blindly in the dark for its ideal; and it has caused many a heart-wrench to relegate some idealism of movements which do not move, to the dead ashes of blasted hopes and promises.

Throughout all these dreams and hopes and fears and attacks, vituperation and misrepresentation, the trade unionists have plodded along their weary way since the miner of Laurium, three thousand years ago, laid down his pick; and, though phantasmagorias and dreams have lived and died, the wage-earner, with pick and shovel, with hammer and saw and plane, with hands on the lever of the highest developed machines, kept, and keeps, organizing and plodding along toward better conditions of life.

The trade unions not only discuss economics and social problems, but deal with them in a practical fashion calculated to bring about better conditions of life to-day, and thus fit the workers

for the greater struggles for amelioration and emancipation yet to come.

No one having any conception of the labor problems—the struggles of life—would for a moment entertain the notion, much less advise the workers, to abstain from the exercise of their political rights and their political power. On the contrary, trade union action upon the surface is economic action, yet there is no act which the trade unions can take but which in its effect is political.

But, in the exercise of the political power of the workers, that is, the casting of the ballot, we are sometimes urged to throw to the winds the experience and the tangible results of ages, and to hazard the interests of labor in a new era of political partisanship.

We want legislation in the interest of labor; we want legislation executed by labor men; we want trade unionists in Congress and more trades unionists in the State legislatures, in our municipal councils and in our executive offices; we want trade unionists on the magisterial benches, and those convinced of the justice of our cause, with the courage of their convictions, in the highest offices of our land. We shall secure them, too, by acting as trade unionists rather than turning our trade unions into partisan ward clubs.

Our movement is of the wage-earning class, recognizing that class interests, that class advancement, that class progress is best made by working class trade union action. That we shall receive the coöperation of others, goes without saying; but only as the trade unions grow in numbers, in power and in intelligence, shall we disenthrall the minds and freedom of action of sympathizers with our cause, who gladly await the hour to place the best sheaves of their laurels of learning at the feet of the advancing hosts of organized labor.

Spencer has said that it has always been the remnant in society which has saved it from reaction or barbarism. To-day modern society is beginning to realize that the trade unions are the only hope of our civilization, and to regard them as the only power whose mission it is to evolve order out of our social chaos, to save us from reaction, brutality and perhaps barbarism. Our progress may be slow, yet it is the fastest, the safest and best evolved from the human mind; and even in its present form, is the germ of a future state which all will hail with glad acclaim. Then to

nurture it, to concentrate our energies in order that its progress may be sure, that its advancement may be unimpeded, that its development may be unrestricted and its success unimpaired, is the duty of every intelligent worker, every lover of the human race.

The toilers of our country look to you to devise the ways and means by which a more thorough organization of the wage-earners may be accomplished, and to save our children in their infancy from being forced into the maelstrom of wage slavery. Let us see to it that they are not dwarfed in body and mind, or brought to a premature death by early drudgery; give them the sunshine of the school-room and playground, instead of the factory and the workshop. To protect the workers in their inalienable rights to a higher and better life; to protect them, not only as equals before the law, but also in their rights to the product of their labor; to protect their lives, their limbs, their health, their homes, their firesides, their liberties as men, as workers, and as citizens; to overcome and conquer prejudice and antagonism; to secure to them the right to life, and the opportunity to maintain that life; the right to be full sharers in the abundance which is the result of their brain and brawn, and the civilization of which they are the founders and the mainstay; to this the workers are entitled beyond the cavil of a doubt. With nothing less ought they, or will they, be satisfied. The attainment of these is the glorious mission of the trade unions. No higher or nobler mission ever fell to the lot of a people than that committed to the working class—a class of which we have the honor to be members. *—From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Kansas City, Mo., December, 1898.*

I believe that as time goes on the wage-earners will continue to become larger sharers per dollar of the wealth produced. I have no fear as to the future of organized labor. I have no fear as to the future of labor. This morning I indicated the fact that there is a constant struggle which has been going on from time immemorial between the wealth possessors and those who produce wealth, and that struggle has manifested itself in different forms, at different times, in different countries. That struggle has continued up to date, and will continue so long as there are diverse interests between the two. . . . There is something I

want to obviate, that I am trying to give my life's work to obviate, that the struggle shall not be so bitter and costly.—*From testimony before United States Industrial Commission, April 18, 1899.*

What is your city but a union of men and women surrendering a portion of their rights and privileges in order that the great good of all may be conserved? What is your state but a greater union? and what is the United States but a vast union?—*From address at Portland, Oregon, August 4, 1902.*

Labor is often spoken of as a commodity, but there is another phase to be considered. . . . You may buy a pound of pork, or a yard of cotton, and calculate upon such a transaction without heart, but when you discuss the question of labor and labor power there is an element of human nature that goes with it. You can not differentiate the labor from the laborer. You can not take labor and disregard the one who performs it. He is made cold by the same blast and made warm by the same summer sun; feels the same pain and is made glad by the same influences; he has the same hopes and the same aspirations; and, as a human being, as a man, as a father and as a fellow-citizen associated with us all, in whose hands is placed the destiny of our republic, the beacon light to the down-trodden of all the earth—it behooves us to look upon the laborer as something more than a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, a mere commodity upon the market.—*From address at Buffalo, N. Y., before the Independent Club, January 8, 1903.*

Professor Leroy, one of the greatest sociologists of our time, said that after years of study and remaining in the slums of the great city, he found that the labor unions were the greatest factors in improving the conditions of the lowest grades of human society.

President Lincoln, in a speech at Hartford in 1860, referring to the New England shoe workers' strike, said:

Thank God, we have a system of labor where there can be a strike. Whatever the pressure, there is a point where the workingmen may stop.

Thorold Rogers, the greatest historian of economics, says:

I look to the trade unions as the principal means for benefiting the condition of the working classes.

On another occasion he said:

Capital is the fruit of labor and could not exist if labor had not first existed. Labor, therefore, deserves much the higher consideration.

Wendell Phillips said:

I rejoice at every effort workingmen make to organize. I hail the labor movement; it is my only hope for democracy. Organize and stand together. Let the nation hear a united demand from the laboring voice.

Gladstone said:

Trade unions are the bulwarks of modern democracies.

The National Association of Builders says:

It is eminently dangerous and destructive to the best interests of the individual wage-worker to proceed as though there were no other wage-workers, and infinitely to his advantage to seek for and adopt measures by which he may move so as not to jar and perhaps overturn himself as well as others.

Dr. Ingraham, doctor of philosophy, said:

Attacked and denounced as scarcely any other institution has been, the unions have thriven and grown in face of opposition. This healthy vitality has been due to the fact that they were a genuine product of social needs, indispensable as a protest and a struggle against the abuses of industrial government, and inevitable as a consequence of that consciousness of strength inspired by the concentration of numbers under the new conditions of industry.

From Labor Day Address, Indianapolis, Ind., 1903.

The great good any movement has accomplished in the uplifting of the masses has never been accorded it during the militant stages of its achievement; and ours is not and can not be an exception. It must remain for the student and historian of the future to portray the struggles, the burdens, the heroism, the hopes, the aspirations, and marvelous achievements of our great movement. All we can do in our day is to keep on and on, true to our highest conception of duty, hence true to our fellows, consciously and confidently relying upon the future, unhampered by prejudice and sordid avarice, to accord our purposes, efforts, and achievements in the interest of humanity the place in history

which they justly deserve.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Boston, Mass., November, 1903.*

A man can, upon the prairie, build himself a hut and apply the torch to it. Let him attempt to do that in any one of our metropolitan cities and he will be arrested and put into jail, for out upon the plain he does himself the only injury that is being done; in the city he endangers the life, and the property, and the peace and tranquillity of his neighbors. If in the old, old time a man wanted to sell his labor to another, under the old and primitive conditions; if he desired to accept poor economic conditions as the result of his work, he injured no one but himself. In our day of highly developed industry, with concentrated wealth under the direction of the few—or comparatively few—the individual workman who attempts to make a bargain with the directors or the representatives of such a directorate simply places himself in the position of a helpless, rudderless craft on a tempestuous ocean. If he but did himself a wrong, we might pity him and concede not only his legal but his moral right; but for the workman who toils for wages, and expects to end his days in the wage-earning class, as conditions seem to point, it will be a necessity —his bounden duty to himself, his family, to his fellow-men, and to those who are to come after him—to join in the union with his fellow-craftsmen and fellow-workmen to uphold the standard of life and to make joint effort for the uplifting of the wage-workers, and with them the whole social fabric of our time and for the time to come.—*From address before The National Civic Federation, New York, N. Y., December, 1903.*

The theory of the Knights of Labor, when alive, was the organization of the wage-earners primarily, but others were admitted, except lawyers and bankers; and the organization of all those who accepted its platform of principles, the organization of these in bodies regardless of their trade, occupation, vocation, or profession. It undertook to wipe out the lines of industry and make one whole organization of all classes of labor.

I took occasion at one time to say, in making comparison, that that theory was not only untenable, but that it was unnatural; that it would be just as impractical for purposes of achieving anything in the interest of the working people as it would be if

applied to the different divisions of men in an army corps, perhaps cavalrymen, artillerymen, infantrymen, foot and horse soldiers, all being mixed up in a great potpourri. Chaos and confusion would reign if an order were given to it to advance. The greatest safety for such an army corps, made up in such a fashion, would be in remaining stationary. An order to advance would be its own annihilation.—*From hearing before Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, January 13-March 22, 1904, on bill to limit meaning of the word "conspiracy."*

That so long as man shall live and have his being, so long as there shall dwell in the human heart a desire for something better and nobler, so long as there is in the human mind the germ of the belief in human justice and human liberty, so long as there is in the whole makeup of man a desire to be a brother to his fellow-man, so long will there be the labor movement.

It expresses all of the struggles of the past, all the sacrifices and bitterness that the human family has tasted in its experience. The movement embraces all the tenderness of the human family, all of its hopes and all of its aspirations for the real liberty of mankind.

The labor movement is founded on the bedrock of opposition to wrong. It is based on the aspiration for right. I want you, and all of us, to coöperate with the best that is within us to make the labor movement strong and powerful and influential, and that it may grow day by day. And the day that comes shall see for it a better and brighter path than the day that has gone, and open up a new vista of light and life and happiness for the home and fireside and the wife and the children. And that the burdens of labor shall be lighter and man shall be a brother to his fellow-man.—*From address at Firemen's Convention, Washington, D. C., August, 1904.*

It is the duty of man to work, but work was never designed and ought never to be so prostituted as to lead to debasement or slavery.—*American Federationist, November, 1904.*

I am trade unionist here for the same reason that I would be a trade unionist in Great Britain, for the same reason that I would be a revolutionist in Russia.

The people of Russia have too long borne the tyranny from

which they have suffered. In Russia, without the freedom of speech or of the press, the thoughts of the discontented must find their vent somewhere or somehow, and we find it, to-day when Russia is stirred from center to circumference, in the demand of the people there for human rights.

We are trade unionists in the United States, we are trade unionists in Great Britain, because opportunities are afforded for free association, for free speech, the free assemblage, and the free press, and because we have these guarantees of freedom we find in our movement in the United States the opportunity for evolution rather than revolution.—*From address at meeting of Plate Printers Union No. 2, Washington, D. C., January 21, 1905.*

During former periods of industrial crises or trade stagnation, when labor complacently acquiesced in wage reductions, the political economists of the day proclaimed and employers generally followed the theory that the law of "supply and demand" governed all things; that "labor is a commodity to be bought in the open market" and that the wages paid to labor were of necessity controlled by the law of supply and demand.

The laborers seemed defenceless; they were compelled to abide by that inexorable so-called law, cruelly and heartlessly applied; human hearts, manhood, womanhood, childhood, with all that these imply, were entirely denied consideration.

That the law of supply and demand has its place in nature and in primitive, natural conditions, no thinking man will dispute; but when we realize what science has done and what progress has been made to overcome the primitive conditions of nature; what has been accomplished in machinery and tools of labor, in the means of transportation of products and of man, the means of transmission of information and intelligence, the fact becomes immediately patent that man has made nature conform to his wants and that the original conception of the law of supply and demand has been largely overcome, and can be still further overcome by intelligent, comprehensive and determined action of the wage-earners, who by their associated effort shall refuse to have their brain and brawn, their hearts and the hearts of those beloved by them, weighed in the same scale with the side of a hog or a bushel of coal.

For quite a period of years we have not heard the claim of

the inexorability of the law of supply and demand discussed, particularly so far as its application to labor is concerned. I have looked in vain for nearly ten years for an argument to be made on that subject by the old school of political economists and the antagonists to labor. It may even seem strange that I should discuss it in this report, but my purpose in addressing myself to this is to rivet your attention to the fact that the improvement in our lives and in our homes is due to the organized effort of the working people of our country and to it alone. The reason for the absence of discussion by our opponents of the so-called law of supply and demand is that the conditions of labor have gone onward and upward; that we are in deadly earnest and that we shall not permit ourselves to be forced backward or downward.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Norfolk, Va., November, 1907.*

It must be remembered that the trade union *while not a trust* is just as inevitable and logical a development as the trust itself. The trade union finds its greatest development under the same economic conditions which produce the trust; that is, the introduction of machinery, the subdivision of industry, the adoption of vast and complicated systems of production which obliterate the individuality of the worker and thus force him into an association, but not a trust, with his fellows in order that collectively they may protect their rights as wage-workers and as citizens and also guard the interests of all workers.

Let me reiterate most emphatically here and now that *the trade union is not, and from its very nature can not be, a trust.* It is sometimes derisively called a trust by those who expose their own ignorance of economic first principles in making such a statement.

The trade union is the *voluntary association of the many for the benefit of all* the community. The trust is the voluntary association of the few for their own benefit. The trade union puts no limit upon its membership, except that of skill and character, it welcomes every wage-worker. In fact, its strength and influence rest in its universal adoption by the wage-workers as the permanent and potent method of voicing their needs. Were every wage-worker in the country a member of organized labor, still would there be no labor trust.

Trusts consist of organizations for the control of the products of labor. Laborers have not a product for sale. They possess their labor power; that is, their power to produce. Certainly there can not be a trust in anything which has not been produced. Hence, for this if for no other potent reason, it is economically unsound as well as it is untrue to designate organizations of labor as trusts.—*American Federationist, November, 1907.*

Doing for people what they can and ought to do for themselves is a dangerous experiment. In the last analysis the welfare of the workers depends upon their own initiative. Whatever is done under the guise of philanthropy or social morality which in any way lessens initiative is the greatest crime that can be committed against the toilers. Let social busy-bodies and professional "public morals experts" in their fads reflect upon the perils they rashly invite under this pretense of social welfare.—*From pamphlet, "The Workers and The Eight-Hour Work-day," 1915.*

Suppose the trade and labor unions of America could be crushed and driven out of existence by legislation and court decrees; what then? Is it not true that each worker would become an irresponsible man without association with his fellows, without opportunity for consultation, and without the restraining as well as the constructive influence which open and voluntary organization gives? Then would the workers seek their own redress in their own individual way. Is such a condition desirable, or tolerable to the normal, rational, intelligent, peaceful organizations of labor of our day?—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Denver, Col., November, 1908.*

Non-unionists who reap the rewards of union effort, without contributing a dollar or risking a loss of a day, are parasites. They are reaping a benefit from the union spirit, while they themselves are debasing genuine manhood. Having rights, they are too cowardly to stand up for them—the right of being one of the parties to a two-party contract; the right to take a share in the world-wide struggle of labor for the advance of the working classes; the right to speak up for labor, before the employer, before the public, before the lawgivers, before the oppressors of

working women and children. What would become of the general movement for factory and mine inspection, safety appliances in regard to machinery, for enforcing labor bureau laws, for compensation in case of injuries, for increasing the age when children may go to work, the limitation of their hours of labor, etc., etc., were it not for the trade unions? Every non-union employee knows the truth which such questions must evoke in reply. The consequence must be, and sooner or later always is, that the still, small voice of honor, working without cease and secretly in each man's mind and heart, causes him to yearn for the fellowship of the men of courage gathered together in the unions, and finally impels him to seize the occasion to break away from his feudal relations with his employer and convert the latter from a master into a fellow-creature who is in the market to buy something from his equal—the man who sells his labor power.—*American Federationist, June, 1910.*

Competition among mankind is to be encouraged or discouraged as it proves helpful or harmful to the race. By the tests of helpfulness or harmfulness it is legitimate or illegitimate. It is legitimate, and presumably will by necessity exist in all future society, of whatever form, when practiced under equal conditions of just opportunity to obtain the objects competed for among the human beings in any given group. It is illegitimate, in the present economic conditions of society, wherever men, deprived of their just opportunities for existence and self-development and the full products of their past labor, are obliged to compete through a forced sale of their labor power with other men similarly situated, to gain the necessaries of life. Dr. Eliot may unfairly select and quote, to the extent this globe affords, illustrations that lie in the class of beneficial competition, such as is seen "in family, school, and college," and prove with every case his argument for competition. But he must avoid, as he has knowingly done, illustrations of the economic struggle. In this domain, unrestricted competition among the masses of wage-workers, possessed individually of but a short-time purchase of independent existence, reduces them to work-place conditions and to a wage which, if not slavery and starvation, are deprivative to a degree abhorrent to all men moved by a sense of social justice. Especially true is this fact in the presence of the wealth

produced in so great measure by the wage-workers and of the practical possibilities of production in the present age.—*American Federationist, November, 1910.*

"The narrowness of trade unionism." This phrase passes current, at full face value, in every camp and even in every grouplet of "intellectuals." In going the whole round of the "isms," sociological, ethical, legal, political, reformatory, played-out popular crazes, or "just-out" social panaceas, one will hear expressed by the leaders a sentiment that the trade unionists are hide-bound conservatives—because they decline to rush in a body to take the magic medicine for social ills offered by the particular "ism" advocated by the critic in each particular case.

It is a fact that trade unionism in America moves on in its own set and deliberate way. In so doing, it has outlived wave upon wave of hastily conceived so-called "broad" movements that were to reconstruct society in a single season. And it has sufficiently good cause for continuing its own reasoned-out course.

A full defense of trade unionism against the charge of narrowness would require many volumes, were each to be separately devoted to counter-statements and argumentation addressed to every critic advocating his own special "ism" as against trade unionism. But there is one broad bottom fact underlying all the criticisms of trade unionism based on its alleged narrowness. That fact is, that *trade unionism is not narrow.*

The locomotive engine is not "narrow" because it is not fitted to run on highways and by-ways and waterways as it is for railways, nor is the steamship "narrow" because it can not be made to run on land. But steam, the motive power, can be so applied that it is effective on both land and water. An engine is adapted to a special use; steam in its applications is universal.

Similarly, a trade union is not a machine fitted to the work of directly affecting all the civic, social, and political changes necessary in society. But it first of all teaches the working classes the power of combination. Thenceforward it disciplines them, leads them to perform tasks that are possible, and permits the members of any of its affiliated bodies to attempt any form of social experiment which does not imperil the organization as a whole. The spirit of combination has the immediate effects of self-confidence for the democratic elements in the unions, of

growth in the loyalty of workingman for workingman, of constant progressive achievement not confined to restricted limits. It is therefore a motive power continuously and variously applicable as the masses move forward and upward in their individual and collective development.

The spirit of combination in the wage-workers has as a motive power many points of resemblance to that of steam (or for that matter electricity) in the mechanical world. One of these points is that the machine to be moved must not be too big or too complex for the engine. Theorist social reformers beyond enumeration have in vain offered their utopian inventions to the masses because the latter, endowed with common sense, have, on due observation, refused to supply the needed wasteful power to make the inventions go. If they had done so for a time, they could but have exhibited the folly of going to greater pains and troubles than the present social machinery requires. The history of the United States is plentifully illustrated with millennial experiments, illusory for the reason that their maintenance in some way overtaxed their supporters, accustomed to making progress in the freedom and opportunity of America even as it is.

No other mechanism for carrying out the will of the wage-workers in the domain in which they can especially benefit themselves has equaled the trade union and the trade union movement in bringing desired results. No other has equally stood the test of time. No other has thrown anything like the light upon the state of mind of the masses with respect to their economic education. No other has been able to show how intensely practical the workingmen are—nor how devoted they can show themselves to a clearly defined principle, nor how ready they are to trust to their own leadership, nor how they invariably refuse, as a class, to embark in fiction-born utopian ventures. The trade union has been broad enough for all practical purposes.

And yet trade unionism is the soundest base yet laid for every project that gives promise to the working class for a firm and solid advance. Moving step by step, trade unionism contains within itself, as a movement and as a mechanism, the possibilities for establishing whatever social institution the future shall develop for the workers as the predestined universal element in control of society.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.*

A hundred times we have said it, and we say it again, that trade unionism contains within itself the potentialities of working-class regeneration. It is practical democracy; it affords within itself daily object lessons in ideal justice; it breathes into the working classes the spirit of unity; it provides a field for noble comradeship, for deeds of loyalty, for self-sacrifice beneficial to one's fellow-workers. In contending for the political and economic rights of its members, the trade union teaches those rights to the entire working class. And on a knowledge of those rights, society will establish its future development.—*American Federationist, July, 1911.*

The ground-work principle of America's labor movement has been to recognize that first things must come first. The primary essential in our mission has been the protection of the wage-worker, now; to increase his wages; to cut hours off the long workday, which was killing him; to improve the safety and the sanitary conditions of the work-shop; to free him from the tyrannies, petty or otherwise, which served to make his existence a slavery. These, in the nature of things, I repeat, were and are the primary objects of trade unionism.

Our great Federation has uniformly refused to surrender this conviction and to rush to the support of any one of the numerous society-saving or society-destroying schemes which decade by decade have been sprung upon this country. A score of such schemes, having a national scope, and being for the passing day subject to popular discussion, have gone down behind the horizon and are now but ancient history. But while our Federation has thus been conservative, it has ever had its face turned toward whatever reforms, in politics or economics, could be of direct and obvious benefit to the working classes. It has never given up its birthright for a mess of pottage. It has pursued its avowed policy with the conviction that if the lesser and immediate demands of labor could not be obtained now from society as it is, it would be mere dreaming to preach and pursue that will-o'-the-wisp, a new society constructed from rainbow materials—a system of society on which even the dreamers themselves have never agreed.—*From Annual Report of A. F. of L. Convention, Atlanta, Ga., November, 1911.*

These three demands of organized labor are comprehended in this larger and ultimate ideal—to enrich, enlarge, and magnify humanity. The influence and the potency of the American Federation of Labor are so well appreciated by the thinkers and leaders in our nation's affairs, that almost every considerable movement for humanitarian, economic, or political reform has endeavored to enlist our approval and support. Men of labor, we play an honorable and important part in the affairs of this great nation. We are daily helping to determine its destiny.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Rochester, N. Y., November, 1912.*

Under the old feudal system, it was not within the power or within the right of workingmen to heed, to take counsel about, to discuss questions of wages, hours of labor and conditions of employment. Then it was held to be a violation of the property right of the master for the workers to attempt to discuss or to determine upon wages and hours and conditions of labor. Indeed, if workingmen, or an individual workingman, attempted to shirk duty, to go elsewhere in search of employment, or what not, so long as he absented himself from the domain of his master, according to the laws and the power of government he was subject to arrest, to be brought back for trial upon the charge of robbing his master of the labor to which that master was entitled, and he was, if found guilty, whipped, publicly whipped, publicly branded on the forehead with the letter "V," which declared him forever a villain. If he repeated the offense one of his ears was cut off and he was branded on the forehead with a red-hot iron with the letter "S," which marked him forever a slave. For the third offense he was hanged to the gibbet. These customs were based on denial to the worker of the right to assert or to claim that he had any right of ownership in himself or his labor power.—*From address at Conference on Anti-Trust Law, New York City, December 12, 1913.*

In improving conditions from day to day the organized labor movement has no "fixed program" for human progress. If you start out with a program everything must conform to it. With theorists, if facts do not conform to their theories, then so much the worse for the facts. Their declarations of theories and ac-

tions refuse to be hampered by facts. We do not set any particular standard, but work for the best possible conditions immediately obtainable for the workers. When they are obtained then we strive for better.

It does not require any elaborate social philosophy or great discernment to know that a wage of $3 a day and a workday of eight hours in sanitary workshops are better than $2.50 a day and a workday of twelve hours under perilous conditions. The working people will not stop when any particular point is reached; they will never stop in their efforts to obtain a better life for themselves, for their wives, for their children, and for all humanity. The object is to attain complete social justice.—*From abstract of testimony before United States Commission on Industrial Relations, New York City, May 21-23, 1914.*

The question propounded centuries ago, "Am I my brother's keeper?" is being answered by the labor movement and the social conscience it arouses. Yes; you are your brother's keeper, and unless you help to lighten his burden yours will be made so much the heavier.—*From address at Wilmington, Del., January, 27, 1916.*

Class is no assurance of genius, ability or wisdom. No man is fit to control the lives of his fellows. The trade unions are the agencies through which wage-earners are working out their destinies and interposing a check upon arbitrary power in industry. The spiritual effect of industrial freedom is of incalculable potency in determining the moral fiber of the nation.—*American Federationist, November, 1916.*

II

LABOR AND THE COMMUNITY

LABOR AND PUBLIC OPINION

The efforts of the toiling masses of our country to carry on the struggles for improved conditions have been met in the spirit of the bitterest antagonism. Our methods to gradually improve the condition of the masses have been regarded and treated as if we were the enemies rather than the friends of the human family. War has practically been declared against the labor organizations, and war measures resorted to in the effort to crush them.

But will they be crushed? We answer No. A thousand times No. The labor movement is the manifestation of that unrest born of the conviction that injustice prevails which needs remedying and supplanting by justice and right. The labor movement voices the aspirations of the toiling masses as well as lays bare their wrongs. It is the means through which tyranny is held in check; it lives in their minds and hearts, and will not and cannot be crushed.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., December, 1892.*

During the year our movement has been assailed with more bitterness from theoreticians than during any preceding year of the existence of our movement. Upon entering upon my present term of office, I issued an appeal to the different schools of thought connected with our movement asking them in the name of all that appeals to our sense of justice to coöperate with us in our efforts to unite and bring relief and success to the masses of labor. I confess no disappointment that this proffer of peace and good will was spurned. In fact, so intense was the malevolence toward the interests of labor displayed, that a few of those whose whole connection with the movement has been that of destruction, sought to inaugurate another movement to undermine

and destroy the trade unions of the country and the American Federation of Labor itself. In a number of instances, local unions attached to nationals affiliated with us, have been rent asunder, and brother workmen have been organized into hostile camps, to the destruction of their own interests and to the delight of all enemies of labor.

It has been the purpose of our movement to look with kindness akin to sympathy upon all efforts of others to organize workers, and with indifference upon those who sought to destroy our movement. It seems to me that the time has come when men who will prostitute the noble purpose of our cause, and in the garb of friendship seek to destroy the trade-union movement, or pervert it into channels by which its power becomes ineffective, and its influence for good impotent, should be pilloried as the enemies of labor, and held, now and forever, in the contempt they so justly deserve.

It behooves our active men to warn our fellow workers from the dangers which lurk in the sophistries of labor's emancipation without the power and influence, the struggles and sacrifices of the trade-union movement. The most effective answer that labor can make to the pessimist, to the would-be union wreckers, is organization, and organization upon a permanent basis. With the growth and permanency of the trade-unions, the power for evil toward our movement and all else will diminish in the exact ratio. Our movement is based on the justice of labor's cause. It is economically, socially and morally sound. It is the champion and defender of the otherwise weak and defenseless; it lives in the hearts and minds of the people. It may meet occasional reverses, but they are simply retreats for more advantageous positions for advances, it is enduring for all time.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, December, 1896.*

The change in public sentiment and the public conscience as manifested in the newspapers, magazines, schools, colleges and universities, which discuss economic and social problems is the best attestation to the intellectual improvement caused by the trade union movement. Trade unionism is neither fantastic nor visionary, but real, practical and substantial in securing increase in wages and the purchasing power of wages and improvement

in the condition of the workers. With increasing incomes and purchasing power of wages, we have decreasing mortality and increasing consumption of all articles produced, heightening the stature of the people and compelling their more general education. The unions develop manhood and establish fraternity, so that organized workers voluntarily assist themselves and contribute to help their fellow-workers of other trades to balk tyranny and attain their rights.—*From Lecture at Cornell University, January, 1901.*

In connection with every strike of any moment, though not, we have observed, in connection with lockouts or blacklisting, a certain portion of the press takes up the cry of "public rights." What, it is asked, becomes of the rights and interests of the "third party" to a labor-capital-controversy, the great, helpless public? The workmen have the right to strike for any reason whatever, good or bad, wise or foolish; and they claim the right to boycott those who have offended them. Employers have the right to discharge men at will, and thus precipitate difficulty. Have the bystanders, the consumers, no rights that the classes named are bound to respect?

Thus runs the argument, and it is plausible. As a rule, those who make it end by advocating some form of compulsory arbitration, or state regulation of wages, hours, and conditions of labor. . . . A great strike entails inconvenience and hardship; but is the public entitled to insist that a man shall work on terms that are unsatisfactory to him, simply because it needs his product?

Men work or engage in business to earn a livelihood, not from motives of altruism. They may stop when they please, just as the farmer may refuse to raise crops without regard to the needs of the consumers. . . . The "public" does not provide for the wage-workers; it leaves them to pursue their interests as best they may, and all they owe the public, legally speaking, is respect for the law.

But, of course, in addition to legal responsibilities and limitations, there are moral responsibilities. Not everything that is lawful is expedient and reasonable; "the extreme of law is the extreme of injustice," it has well been said. It is certainly pertinent to ask whether organized labor has shown itself reck-

less of these moral obligations to the public, whether it has insisted in any considerable number of cases on the letter of the law regardless of all considerations of propriety and reason in a comprehensive sense of these terms.

We have had many strikes of late, some of them of a serious character from the public standpoint. Which side was it which defiantly and scornfully disregarded public opinion and talked about "managing its own business in its own way?" Which side declared that it was impertinent and impudent and outrageous for the "third party" to make its influence felt for peace and adjustment? Which side said that the law was all-sufficient, and that other considerations were mere foolish sentiment and harmful weakness?

In the strike of the anthracite miners, who said: "No concessions, no arbitration?" The presidents of the coal-carrying railroads. Who offered to accept arbitration of the strictly impartial kind? The representatives of the 147,000 miners. The operators and railroads opposed the efforts of the conciliation committee of the industrial department of the Civic Federation, and even the suggestion of President Roosevelt's intervention under a supposed statute, discovered to have been repealed, was resented and characterized as dangerous and vicious. And all this in spite of the fact that railroads enjoy exclusive and valuable privileges from the public, and that the coal-carrying roads were notoriously parties in an illegal monopoly, as shown by the plain statements of the Industrial Commission!

If moral obligations are operative anywhere they are surely operative in cases where the industry affected by a strike is a natural monopoly, where franchises have removed the natural check of supply and demand.

In Chicago there was a strike of teamsters employed by the big packing companies, which are under public accusation of unlawful monopoly. The strikers demanded recognition of their union, an increase of pay and some other things. The packers declined to "deal with strangers" or to recognize the union in any way. The people of Chicago were practically all against the packers, and they had to yield; but they, not the teamsters, at first rejected arbitration and friendly mediation. . . .

It is forgotten that the workman, too, has his "business" to manage, and that to say the least his part in production is as

essential as that of capital. When workmen insist on certain terms, they are not seeking to control the employer's business, but to lay down the conditions of their own participation in that business. Too many still assume that the employer is to be thanked and regarded as a benefactor for paying wages at all, and giving his employees work! This miserable fallacy is back of every arrogant claim put forward by capital. But for it, everybody would see that if the workman has something to arbitrate, so has the employer.

In fine, a candid examination of the facts will satisfy reasonable men that the interests and rights of the public are seldom disregarded by organized labor, and that the obstinacy, superciliousness and bigotry of certain types of employers are responsible for the number, duration and character of strikes and labor contests. Assuredly, no sane man will ask workmen to accept any terms employers choose to grant them. What more can labor do than to agree to accept mediation and arbitration? What more does consideration for the "third party" require?

Let, then, the champions and spokesmen for the public, address their protests and appeals to the backward and short-sighted employers whose name, alas! is still legion. Organized labor needs no conversion. It is ready to do the right thing at the right time.—*American Federationist, July, 1902.*

Consider for a moment who are "the people?" Nothing mythical, I suppose. They are human beings, men and women and children; and of what do they consist, so far as their activities in life are concerned? You say: "Well, this gentleman is a banker." 'Tis true; but, in fact, is he not an employer? Be he an attorney, is he usually not an employer? A man of leisure, is he not usually an employer? As a matter of fact, take the whole gamut of human society, and we find that whatever divisions exist in the economic relations, to each other they constitute employed and employers. It is, therefore, absurd to even imagine that there is in fact a "people" or a "public" outside the pale of those I have enumerated; regardless of which business you may take, aye, even in the professions.—*American Federationist, February, 1908.*

After all, is the public disinterested? Do we not rather find it composed of different groups, some whose interests are similar

to those of the employers involved, and who hence naturally sympathize with them and their position? There are many whose financial welfare is identical with that of the employer, who are dependent upon his prosperity. There are many whose industrial experience as workmen would inevitably predispose them to approve the actions and demands of the employees upon any question. There are many selfish and indifferent to the moral and ethical values of any issue that conflicts with their own comfort. There are some few with broader sympathies and keener and deeper understanding of human nature, who try to maintain the dispassionate attitude of justice toward both, but upon some critical and vital issue can they completely overcome the formative, determining influences of environment, instruction, and the indefinable psychic influences of their own kind? It is a serious and dangerous matter to entrust the determination of issues which concern the life, the happiness, the welfare, and freedom of the workers into the hands of other men who do not and can not know the toilers' world in which they live, move, and have their being.—*American Federationist, January, 1913.*

To public opinion is often attributed a sort of sanctity, a divine origin, an attribute that formerly was attributed to conscience. We have learned that the individual's conscience depends upon his environment, his inherited qualities, his education, and is not something absolute, divine, or different in nature from other faculties. So we also know that *vox populi* is not necessarily *vox dei,* but may be made to approach it as freedom of expression, openness of mind, and truths are allowed to prevail. Public opinion is not a unity but there are various opinions held by different groups making up the public. That group which presents its convictions most persuasively or most insistently, controls the prevailing policy. Conceptions of truths vary with the opportunities and the understanding of the individual or the group. As a group that is a part of the public becomes more influential, able to express more forcibly and clearly its ideals and concepts of justice and truths—things the group has evolved from its labor and daily life with other men—that group may alter the trend and scope of public opinion until it reflects more completely the life and welfare of all mankind. Frequently public opinion is only a prevailing sentiment, determined by

convenience or ignorance. Sometimes it is only a "snap" judgment based on incorrect data. . . . Until all elements exert proportional influence in determining public opinion, until all individuals that make up the public become genuinely and unselfishly desirous of continuously striving for justice to all mankind, public opinion will not become an infallible dispenser of justice.—*American Federationist, February, 1913.*

The unorganized public opinion, after all, may be evanescent, and it may change in 24 hours; or, if it does not, and the workers are defeated in any projected movement by reason of this expression of unorganized public opinion, they may at some time in the future make a new movement in order to secure their demands and aspirations. On the other hand, with the organized expression of public opinion, as I understand it, through a law or a governmental agency, if such a governmental agency shall authoritatively determine that the demands of the working people are unjustified, it puts the seal of disapproval upon the whole movement, and makes it practically impossible for a decade or more for the men and women of labor to give expression to their discontent in some form that shall make for the achievement of their demand and their ideal in that particular movement.—*From hearing before Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, on "Government Investigation of Railway Disputes," January 11, 1917.*

"FRIENDS OF LABOR," PHILANTHROPIC AND DOCTRINAIRE

We have often a very grave complaint to make against many of our charitably inclined. The first thought of those known to belong to some charitable organization is, so far as it affects the wage-earners, to get them to work, to get them a job. Of course, we realize that not only is it desirable for men to work, but we recognize that it is an absolute necessity and a duty for a man to work. But when, for example, there are a number of men who may have engaged in a dispute with their employer relative to a matter of wage, relative to the condition of employment, we protest against you or any one finding a job for another workman in that establishment. . . .

I do not want you for a moment to imagine that I underestimate the earnestness and the zeal that the charity workers manifest in their efforts to allay and alleviate the misery which comes from our present economic state of affairs. But, after all, I think you will agree that it is no remedy for the social and economic ills from which the people suffer. And for all that, as was suggested, what are you going to do with the undeserving poor? What do you do with them? (and they are always with you). No charity worker, I think, will dispute the fact that after all it is simply a patch upon the awful sore of the body economic of our time. . . .

Why not help us as an auxiliary to your charity? Why not have a Union Label League? Why not have a Consumers' Union Label League, and endeavor, not only by your own precept and example, but through your friends, to encourage better wages, better conditions and surroundings for the workers? You would find the union label on your printing, and you would know that union men and women had been employed, and at least that a comparatively fair wage had been paid, rendering them less liable to your charity. There are a thousand and one things in which you can be helpful.—*From address before the Monday Evening Club, Boston, and Representatives of Organized Charities of New England, March 20, 1899.*

We have on previous occasions called attention to the fact that the trade unions and the federal labor unions under the banner of the American Federation of Labor, are composed exclusively of wage-workers, men who work for wages; and the exclusion of others does not necessarily reflect upon them. If professions of sympathy on the part of some who are not wage workers, are at all sincere, they can render the movement much more assistance, and be of far greater service to our cause, by aiding and encouraging the organizations and the work on the outside than by attempting to become members, and in the circles of the meeting endeavoring to control the counsels, decisions and actions of the unions. We court the sympathetic aid of all, but we resent the attempt on the part of any one not a wage worker to try to formulate the policy of the trade union movement.

"The emancipation of the workingmen must be achieved by

the workingmen themselves" is an adage long ago recognized by the trade union movement; and if there are friends of our cause who are ineligible to membership in the trade unions and federal labor unions they will best demonstrate their sympathy by restraining their zeal to become members, and seeking by their supposed "superior" intelligence to fasten themselves upon the wage-workers' movement.

It may be true that some organizations at some time may fall into error; but it is better that we may err and learn by experience to avoid errors in the future than to have men whose interests are not identical with those of the wage-workers direct the affairs of any of our labor organizations or of our general movement. The lesson thus far learned is that those other than wage-workers who seek membership in any of our organizations are either eaten up with their own vanity, or are self-seekers; and in either case it is destructive of the best interests of the workers. That from the counsel of many comes wisdom has long been recognized; and this wisdom is much more far-reaching in its influence for good than the supposed "superior" intelligence of either the professoriat, the business men, the theorists, the self-seekers, or the camp followers.—*American Federationist, April, 1900.*

An increasing number of the ministry are paying attention to labor. They speak about Labor Day, recognizing the movement in the interest of labor. This is exceedingly gratifying. There was a time—and not so long ago, either—when the ministry belonged to the host that prayed for us one minute on Sunday and preyed on us all the rest of the week. It shows that they are becoming anxious about us. They are becoming acquainted with us, and no longer study to learn concerning us from our employers or superintendents.

I noticed that one of the preachers of yesterday asked and pleaded that Sunday be a day of rest and quiet, a day for worship. He implored organized labor to assist in bringing about this state of affairs. I would say to this minister that organized labor is against Sunday labor, and always has been. He had better turn toward those in his own pews, those who spend Sunday on their marrow bones, and blame them for Sunday labor. If the laboring man should refuse to work, this man would discharge him. It has been said that the labor unions are

antagonistic to the church, that they hold their meetings on Sunday at hours which conflict with divine service. Tell me, then, when could they hold their meetings? What's that I hear? Monday mornings? What would your employer say to that? Consider the street car men. When can they hold meetings? The company looks after that detail very well in their case.

One minister has asked organized labor to close the saloons. Organized labor has always looked on the saloon as an evil. It is always the overrich who get drunk and also the very poor. The first demands intoxication for excitement; the second, on five cents' worth of whiskey, forgets his hunger, forgets his long hours, forgets distress. I say that comfortable people do not get drunk. The man who has moderate hours of labor does not indulge to excess in liquor. The charge that labor unions antagonize the church is unfounded. The fact is, that instead of antagonizing the church, our modern church has antagonized the working-men. Let the minister try and come among us and learn who we are.—*American Federationist, October, 1900.*

In connection with this question of labels should be mentioned the fact that in some cities some well-meaning, philanthropic ladies have organized consumers' leagues. These leagues were originally intended to be helpful to secure amelioration in the condition of some of the working people. Lately some of these leagues have issued a label to employers simply because the sanitary conditions in which the employees work were improved, and these labels issued without regard to any consideration as to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, and in some instances in rivalry to the union label of the organization of the craft. I do not believe that these consumers' leagues have intended to work counter to the labor movement, and as a result of a conference recently had with a representative of a consumers' league, when the matter was explained, the assurance was given that the issuance of the league's label would be discontinued. Our union labels stand for improved sanitation as one of the conditions necessary to entitle an employer to their use. Further efforts in this direction will, I hope, eliminate this unintentional injury.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Boston, Mass., November, 1903.*

If all the welfare workers, the social uplifters, the social legislative enthusiasts would apply the efforts and money they are now diverting to other causes to the work of promoting organization, they would greatly shorten the time necessary to put all workers in a position where they could solve their own problems, fight their own battles, and promote their own welfare as free, equal men and women.—*From pamphlet "The Workers and The Eight-Hour Work-day," 1915.*

While we appreciate the difficulties in the administration of charity organizations, we have more than once had our gorge rise at the lack of discrimination by contributors to the *Survey* between the working classes and the pauperized classes, and at the assumption that the rich as a class were the givers and the workers as a class the receivers of charitable benefits. The fact is, the workers perform infinitely more service for the unfortunate than is done by the rich. For one thing, it is undoubtedly taxation bearing on the workers that pays the larger part for the maintenance of public institutions. And it is the workers who day by day, without fail, both in their organizations and as individuals, help their weaker brothers and sisters in the struggle. —*American Federationist, August, 1910.*

Many a plain, unschooled toiler in the ranks has an understanding of industrial conditions and forces that makes him an authority in that field. Though their terms may not be as nicely discriminating as those of the more conventional "economist," yet they know the realities of economics, what is practicable, and what is merely theoretical and speculative. Culture does not consist wholly of book learning but is an attitude of mind, alert and aware of tendencies, able and willing to discern the real from the false, the enduring from the ephemeral. Nor would we discredit the work of the colleges, universities or social workers, nor undervalue the constructive work done by these agencies in helping to establish a more sympathetic, democratic understanding of social and industrial problems among all the people. It is because we deprecate any action or policy that detracts from the value of that work, that we deplore the assumption of censorship and arrogance on the part of any. . . . The workers are not bugs to be examined under the lenses of a microscope by the

"intellectuals" on a sociological slumming tour. The men and women of labor are not only willing to be examined, but will examine themselves and in turn reverse the lens and examine the examiners at the other end.—*American Federationist, February, 1913.*

For several years the workers in the American labor movement have manifested their competency to deal with the gravest situations and problems, and while willing to give heed and careful consideration to any suggestion or proposition coming from any other agency, desirous of being helpful to the labor movement and to the labor cause, it will not yield any field of activity directly affecting the workers to any agency other than the workers themselves. We commend to the consideration of the self-constituted guardians of labor the fact that the American labor movement has had to contend with organized antagonism of no mean caliber; with enemies avowed and pseudo; with hypocritical pretenders; with subsidized institutions and associations, and that the labor movement has never run away from the battle or the contest, and is now in a stronger, more powerful and influential position for service than at any time in its history.—*American Federationist, April, 1916.*

The American labor movement has insisted upon the inherent dignity and ability of wage-earners, and has declared that they are intelligently competent to deal with their own affairs in a democratic fashion and to determine and formulate their own policies.

This long-established practice of American labor has provoked criticism and hostility on the part of that group who have sympathy but whose understanding of labor problems is academic. This group in other countries is called the "Intellectuals" and whenever given opportunity sought and seeks to dominate the labor movement.

The American labor movement has always been willing to accept the sympathetic coöperation of this group but has rejected all attempts at leadership or domination.

American workers insist that it is an essential application of democratic principles that they work out their own problems in their own way.—*American Federationist, April, 1918.*

There is a group of faddists in this country who advocate ultra aims and who are intolerant of and hostile to the bona fide practical and constructive labor movement. It is part of their stock in trade to be "different," thereby creating a scope of activity for themselves. Their livelihood depends upon subsidies; they are professional friends of labor.

The labor movement does not discount the service to civilization rendered by intellectual ability, but it is equally convinced that there is a vast supply of important fundamental knowledge that can be secured only through the slow accumulation of deductions from experience. In understanding and solving labor problems, information gained in the college lecture room or in doctrinaire discussions is not a substitute for the knowledge gained through solving labor problems in the shop, in the mill, or in the mine. Intellectuals usually suspend their labor programs from sky hooks. Their practical efforts are confined to criticizing the achievements and the methods of workingmen. They can find nothing good in the practical structure of labor organization which workers have built upon solid foundations resting upon the ground where the labor problems exist and extending upward as far as the foundation structure will sustain.

Many of the "intellectuals" have joined in a campaign of carping criticism, either direct or indirect, and insidious attack upon the A. F. of L. Instead of carrying out a wholly destructive policy in an endeavor to weaken the influence of the A. F. of L., and lower the morale of the only organization that can render effective service to the government in this critical period, the true intellectuals have another and a legitimate field. They can act as advisers and the formulators of constructive plans and policies to be submitted to democratic consideration and decision by the workers themselves in the American labor movement.

Let them return to their rightful work and acquiesce in the right of the labor movement to determine its own aims and policies and to organize and determine its own agencies and methods. Friendly constructive criticism is always welcome from any source, but the attempt to bulldoze or dominate the labor movement by others than the workers themselves will be resisted and resented to the uttermost.—*American Federationist, May, 1918.*

The *New Republic* has constituted itself the self-appointed director of the American labor movement. It has sought to simulate a seeming friendship by articles helpful in their interpretation of the purposes to be achieved by collective action. These articles were the leverage by which the *New Republic* hoped to establish a relation to the trade union movement that would enable it to dictate policies. By criticizing existing policies and leadership in the labor movement the *New Republic* has persistently endeavored to create misunderstandings and division between the British labor movement and that of the United States, and to divide American workers upon domestic and foreign labor policies. The *New Republic* always speaks upon labor matters as one having superior revelation and therefore speaking with authority to those who perforce must accept masked advice and admonitions. The *New Republic* fails to project itself into the facts and experiences of workers' lives, but from a safe metaphysical distance hands down policies and plans which the workers must adopt or incur the displeasure of this new overlord.—*American Federationist, August, 1918.*

THE NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION

I think I can without vanity claim to be one of the earliest members of The National Civic Federation, long before it was known as The National Civic Federation. I had faith in it; I had faith in the idea; I believed that it was capable of accomplishing a very great deal of good. . . . I would not have one believe that we can solve all the problems of our economic life by the Civic Federation. No man surrenders one jot of his opinions or his rights in becoming attached to the Civic Federation. I believe that the greatest strength of the concerted movement lies in the fact that we strongly hold to the principles and convictions that we held before we became associated with the Civic Federation, and that our best common interests are conserved by meeting in the conciliation board and our endeavors to bring about a common understanding upon contested points. —*From address at meeting of The National Civic Federation, New York City, December 12, 1906.*

The men of labor realize that while in this forum are men who strongly differ on matters of interest, of policy, of philosophy, of

principle, and who may all strongly contend for the faith that is in them, no man surrenders his point of view by his association in The National Civic Federation. I imagine that many of you ladies and gentlemen who are here this evening have participated in other meetings and I believe that you will agree with my statement when I say that the representatives of labor have not been mealy-mouthed in the assertion of the faith which they hold, and we are not going to be so to-night. I am ready to acknowledge, and I do gladly acknowledge, that by reason of our coming together much strife has been avoided, and many reconciliations established where the relations between employer and employee have been ruptured. There is now, due to the organized effort of the working people and of our Civic Federation, a better general concept among all the people of this country of the duties we owe to one another. For instance, there is a better understanding and a more ready acquiescence in the thought that the labor of children must be restricted, and we are united in the common effort to so restrict it. And as to the discussion of these past few days, and particularly to-day, of the question of compensation for accidents and their prevention, I ask our hypercritical friends where on earth they can find a body of men in which large employers of labor, great captains of industry, sit in counsel with the representatives, and true representatives, of labor, to try and devise ways and means by which injury and accidents may be prevented and compensation given where accidents are unavoidable.—*From address at annual meeting of The National Civic Federation, New York City, January, 1911.*

Why should C. W. Post and the other radicals of the Manufacturers' Association rail at organized labor and the Civic Federation? The socialists are doing their work in this respect most faithfully. There is a striking similarity in the tone and phraseology in the attacks on the trade unionists and the Civic Federation in Post's advertisements and in the similar attacks of the socialists. There are the same bitterness, the same baseless assertion, the same unreasonableness of attitude. Post, on inditing his most furious articles against the employers and organized workers who believe in systematized methods in endeavoring to

maintain all possible industrial peace might count with certainty on having them inserted without charge if he were to send them in some socialist's name to the Chicago *Daily Socialist,* the New York *Call,* the *International Socialist Review,* the Milwaukee *Democratic Herald,* and the New York *Volkszeitung* or the New York *Vorwaerts.* Post and the socialists are in this instance the proverbial "strange bedfellows" that are made by politics, for in both these parties the animus of their onslaughts is a base form of politics which includes the weakening, if not the destruction, of the two institutions which stand in the way of their designs, namely, the trade union movement as governed by its present principles and the Civic Federation. It is really a fortunate thing for the trade union men in the Civic Federation that they can point on the one hand to the venomous Post and on the other to the bitter-tongued socialists and direct the attention of the country to the resemblances between them, which are the reverse of flattering to either.

John Kirby, Jr., president of the National Association of Manufacturers, recently denounced the Civic Federation because Samuel Gompers and John Mitchell were "not only participants, but moving spirits in the movement as well as officers in good standing," and because of the "doctrines they preach." Kirby hoped the day was not far distant when the Civic Federation would "clear its literature of the union label." He quoted a manufacturer as telegraphing to him: "I am opposed to our sending delegates to Gompers' convention"—the annual meeting of the Civic Federation—and another as saying: "I agree absolutely with your action in declining to appoint delegates to The National Civic Federation of Gomperism," and another, "There ought to be some way to enlighten the innocent or assumed innocent members of the Civic Federation that they are the tools of organized labor." C. W. Post had the following, August, 1909: "The *Square Deal* has persistently called attention to the fact that The National Civic Federation has almost uniformly lent itself to the support of the 'Labor Trust' in its attacks on the industry of the country and the general welfare of the people. We can recall no instance in which it has failed to obey the wishes and behests of Gompers and Mitchell," etc. . . .

When a man like President Seth Low of The National Civic

Federation, who for a quarter of a century has systematically given time to this work, comes forward and lends his influence, his honored name, his experience, his judgment, his character, to this purpose, the act to our mind should command the respectful attention of the entire American public, and when the history of the last decade shows that The National Civic Federation has, time and again, by bringing together the representatives of the employing class and of the employed class, prevented losses amounting to millions that can not be calculated—and when any such conference has been held due to the efforts of the Civic Federation, the results have ever been to the advantage of labor —it seems to us that this fact should further arrest the attention of the public and insure commendation of the movement. There is a field for the work of such an institution.—*American Federationist, March, 1911.*

The Civic Federation has a department of mediation. It undertakes no effort to arbitrate unless voluntarily called to do so by both sides. It has brought together employers and workingmen engaged in tremendously important disputes, who it seemed could not be brought together for the purpose of meeting and discussing their diverse points of view and diverse interests. The result has been that agreements have been reached between large bodies of workers and large employers and that terms and conditions of labor have been improved at least to the temporary mutual satisfaction of both parties to the dispute. . . .

The National Civic Federation is a purely voluntary organization. There is no such thing as membership in the ordinary sense of the term. Men who are willing to give or to secure aid, simply attend. The officers are simply for the purpose of administration. Those who come to the annual meetings elect the officers.

The relations existing between the men in this organization and the representatives of the national labor movement have no parallel in any other country. . . . I am not prepared to say as to the motives of the men of the Civic Federation; but they have been instrumental in bringing together the representatives of the employers and the representatives of the workingmen after all other agencies have proved futile in bringing them together. The agencies of that organization have succeeded time and time

again when no other means were available.—*From abstract of testimony before United States Commission on Industrial Relations, New York City, May 21-23, 1914.*

Though a man of means [Seth Low] it was his aim to bring a proper reward to the toilers for their services. He had a deep regard for their rights as men and as citizens. As a mediator and conciliator in disputes between workers and employers he brought to his aid his wonderful mentality, the sympathetic pulsations of his being and the dominating characteristic of ability to find solutions of great problems. In my whole life I have never met any other man who had such mastery of himself and who had so much sympathetic influence to persuade men to take his point of view; and though not infallible and, like all humans, likely to err in judgment, yet his success lay in the fact that his good sense and earnestness and the sympathy of his character guided him aright. I had the pleasure of counting him a friend. I know by long years of intimate association with him in his work that he rendered untold and incalculable service to mankind —to the workers particularly.

In the passing of Seth Low, America has lost one of her greatest sons.—*From statement prepared for meeting of The National Civic Federation in New York City, January 22, 1917.*

LABOR AND THE FARMER

When the farmers are organized, I have no hesitation in believing that they will formulate the propositions and the means by which relief can come to them. I believe that their hours of labor should be reduced. May I be permitted to say in connection with this, that I know that the general notion of the farmer, of the employing farmer, is that you can not finish the work on the farm unless you start in at sun up and work until sun down, and then work around the farm house or around the house and in the kitchen and in the barn.—*From testimony before United States Industrial Commission, April 18, 1899.*

Considerable correspondence has been had with the representatives of the American Society of Equity, the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of Texas, and other representative

bodies of farmers. Much has been done to bring the men of the farms and the men of the factory and workshop into closer touch, better understanding and reciprocal relations to aid each other in the advancement of their rights, and to protect each other against aggression of opponents.

The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of Texas adopted resolutions pledging the farmers of the State to give their patronage to the products of union labor and particularly those bearing the union label. . . .

We can in this convention do nothing of greater promise for tangible results in the interests of labor in factory, field, workshop or mine than to establish the most fraternal relations and bring about mutual reciprocal aid between the organizations of labor and the organizations of farmers.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Norfolk, Va., November, 1907.*

We have frequently interchanged fraternal delegates between the organizations of the farmers of our country and our Federation, and there has grown a closer bond of unity and action in these respective movements. On many occasions invitations have been extended to me to attend the conventions of the organized farmers, the last one being from the National Farmers' Union (Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union) to attend its annual convention at Fort Worth, Texas, September 1.

By authority and direction of the Executive Council, this invitation was accepted. I attended the convention, and apart from conveying the fraternal greetings of the men of labor in the industrial field, I delivered two addresses to the convention, and one to a mass meeting of farmers while at Fort Worth.

It has been gratifying to me to have been well received at many conventions and meetings, but such enthusiasm and sincere appreciation as that accorded to me by the farmers at their national convention have never been excelled. In addition to a unanimous, rising, and spontaneous expression of confidence and gratitude, the convention later manifesting its earnest desire for coöperative action with the union workers in our Federation, adopted the following report and resolutions:

"The interests of the farmers and of the industrial workers are not only closely allied, but they have been, and can be, further promoted by mutual assistance and coöperation nationally, as they have in the states; and we, therefore, recommend the following:

"Resolved, That a national legislative committee be created for the purpose of furthering such legislation that will protect and promote the rights and interests of the farmers and to prevent the enactment of legislation inimical to our interests.

"Resolved, That this convention of the Farmers' Educational and Coöperative Union of America hereby instructs its officers and legislative committee to coöperate with the American Federation of Labor along economic legislation and other lines of mutual benefit and advantage."

The Farmers' Union elected fraternal delegates to this convention, and I recommend that the appointment of a special committee from this convention be authorized to confer with these delegates as to how best the interests of the toilers upon the field and farm, the factory, workshop, mill, and mine, may be mutually protected and advanced.

Authority should also be given to the officers of our Federation to accept in a fraternal spirit the Farmers' Union declaration to coöperate along the lines of legislation and in such other practical spheres where we may be enabled to more thoroughly cultivate the best interests of all.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Denver, Col., November, 1908.*

LABOR AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP

How do the wage-workers as a mass get their opinions on the subjects which most closely affect themselves? What in this respect are the sources of their information? Do they read with sufficient attention the trade union reports, the testimony of experts, the evidence of official bureaus, the "dry statistics" which embody facts of the utmost importance relative to the working classes? Or do they merely glance at occasional daily newspaper sensational stories or the disconnected meager or misleading summaries of serious writings regarding their own general condition?

These are queries not infrequently put to trade union officials by men interested in social problems. In reply, it is to be said that the work of educating the rank and file of union members in such matters has of recent years made much progress. Most of them are to-day qualified judges of testimony respecting statements of fact bearing on labor questions. The primary school in this education is the union meeting. There the members listen to reports of their own committees that deal with such subjects as wages, hours of labor, conditions of employment,

unemployment, sickness, industrial accidents, state of the labor market in their respective occupations, and the proceedings of all sorts of societies that on occasions connect up with their own union work. A sufficient number of union members are readers of the general run of publications on social questions to be enabled to take the floor at a meeting when any particular point on such questions is up and give the rest of the members the practical information regarding it necessary to intelligent action. —*American Federationist, February, 1912.*

The conversion in our country of our poorest class of South European laborers from serfdom to freedom is a social phenomenon in America most encouraging to all of our wage-workers. It teaches that there is to be no permanently degraded class of laborers in this country. The civilization of our masses forbids the thought. That civilization is practically expressed by them in the institution of trade unionism. In every place where the immigrant goes to work he finds that it is the trade union which establishes standards of wages and living conditions, which assimilates the foreigner in American life, and which sanctions and nourishes in the working class thoughts of independence, mutual protection, and a democratic citizenship making for the common uplift.—*American Federationist, April, 1912.*

Workmen, many of whom have been denied the opportunity of even a common school education, by the discussion of problems which are continually arising in their unions, become frequently ready and logical debaters, and are valuable assets in the cause which we are all endeavoring to do our level best to strengthen and make still more effective.—*American Federationist, May, 1912.*

What institution is there in all our country that makes an effort to educate the great number of immigrants that have come to our country? Who makes the effort to reach them? Except the great corporations; I do not mean them. They have reached for them on the other side; they brought them here. We are proud, and justly proud, of our free schools; but with the millions and millions of immigrants that have been brought to our shore within this past ten or twenty years, no effort is made to reach

them. Why, my friends, it is the organizations of labor that send out their missionaries to these poor fellows and that try to bring them within the fold of organization and thus within reach of education.—*From address at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1908.*

It is the duty of the Jewish workers of America to become citizens of this land, to adopt its customs and ways and with whatever effectiveness is within their power to help in the development and progress of higher ideals and institutions for this land which has helped them so much in the struggle for better things. Let the members of the United Hebrew Trades adopt this as their fatherland and give it the same fervent devoted loyalty that they have ever given to all that they have held dear. Let them turn their backs upon the old Zion and the old conceptions and turn their faces toward liberty and freedom, industrial and political, and in their united might fight for the realization of this new purpose, a new Zion that shall mean for them and all Jewish workers better lives in this world and better lives for their children and their children's children.

Put into the daily task and into the relations of fellow workers the same glorifying spirit of poetry and exaltation that has given Jewish music and literature its rare inspiration and power, and by so doing make the United Hebrew Trades organization a power that shall sweep all injustice from the lives of all Hebrew workers, however humble, native born or strangers in our gateway city. Hebrews have been ever mighty men and women in the world's history, may you be like the great of the race.—*From address at meeting of United Hebrew Trades, New York City, May 10, 1915.*

The whole purpose of education is to develop the best men and women to be the most high-minded, resourceful and effective citizens of our republic. Upon the citizens will depend the destiny of the nation and its contribution to institutions of liberty and progress. Citizens under a democratic government must be able and competent to express and maintain their ideals.—*American Federationist, March, 1916.*

III

LABOR AND THE LAW

GOVERNMENT AND LEGISLATION

We have seen laws passed ostensibly in the interests of the people, and particularly in the interests of labor, construed by the courts to apply with particular severity upon labor. The Interstate Commerce Law, enacted with the avowed purpose of protecting the people from discrimination at the hands of transportation companies, has been utilized for no other purpose than to imprison union men employed in transportation service. The so-called Sherman Anti-trust Law, ostensibly enacted to protect the people from unlawful combinations of capital, has simply resulted in the arrest and indictment of union workmen, because in their effort to protect their common interests, their action has been construed to be in restraint of trade. These two laws have been cunningly devised by our antagonists (foolishly acquiesced in by men believing themselves reformers), and have proven to be the incubators of our modern injunction, trial without jury, and imprisonment.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Detroit, Mich., December 11, 1899.*

Some say that the state is an agency through which the people obtain results—that it exists for their service. But the state is not some impersonal thing. It has no existence outside the people that compose it. Its policies and movements can be directed only by those who are organized and therefore able to exercise power and exert influence. The working people who are unorganized have no part in determining the affairs of state—they may benefit or suffer from policies but they have no voice in them. . . .

If the workers surrender control over working relations to legislative and administrative agents, they put their industrial liberty

at the disposal of state agents. They strip themselves bare of means of defense—they can no longer defend themselves by the strike. To insure liberty and personal welfare, personal relations must be controlled only by those concerned.

But after all, even if it is the quicker way, is the quick way always the best way? Suppose you have a boy for whom you are fondly ambitious. You wish him to be a business or a professional success—do you start him in either at the age of ten, or do you wait upon the process of education? When he finally embarks in business or a profession, do you dictate and regulate each feature, or do you advise and leave the boy to solve his own problem and make his own decisions?

So with the eight hour or shorter work-day in private employment. It is as stated in the beginning, the fundamental objective for workers who are seeking better things. But when forced upon them by law, or given them without their appreciating its value, they frequently look upon it as injustice or hardship. They have not been able to make agreements for the adjustment of wages, hence they apprehend that decreasing the hours of work means to them decreased pay.—*From pamphlet "The Workers and The Eight Hour Work-day," 1915.*

For years the toilers have asked legislation of Congress and the state legislatures, which these law-making bodies can grant, and which can be obtained in no other way. The workers have not sought to secure by legislation, or at the hands of government, what they could accomplish by their own initiative and activities.

We have presented legislative measures justified by the development of industrial needs and the conditions of our people, founded upon the essentials of justice and equality before the law, which have for their object the restoration and perpetuation of individual liberty and human freedom.

We have asked Congress for the following legislation:

Amendment of the eight-hour law, so as to extend its provisions to all government employees and to the employees of contractors and sub-contractors doing work for or on behalf of the government.

A law to regulate the labor of convicts, that the states may

protect their free citizens from the unfair competition of the products of convict labor.

General employers' liability law.

A law to protect American workmen from the wholesale and unrestricted immigration of foreign workmen who are brought to our country to lower the American standard of life.

A law that shall safeguard not only American workers but American civilization from all Asiatic immigration.

A law creating a Department of Labor independent of any other department of the government, with a secretary at its head who shall have a seat in the President's Cabinet, on an equality with the secretaries of all other departments, and who, in the President's councils, may have the opportunity to advise a rightful course and to say the right word at the right time for the men and women of labor of our country, the men and women who are performing so great a service to society.

A law that shall accord to the seamen employed on privately owned vessels the rights conceded to all other workmen, when their vessels are in safe harbor.

Laws promotive of the protection and advancement of the material interests of the workers, in such instances only where the object sought could not be secured through the initiative and the activities of the workers themselves.

Each and all of these laws have been denied at the hands of Congress.

But in the recent past, questions of more transcendent importance have arisen. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Danbury Hatters' case has, as already reported to you, placed our voluntary organizations of labor in the category of monopolies, trusts, and combinations in illegal restraint of trade. As that law now stands, it outlaws and makes civilly liable in three-fold damages and in prosecution by the federal government by fine and imprisonment, the members of labor organizations who collectively exercise their normal, natural functions and activities of organized existence in furtherance of their natural and personal rights. . . .

In consequence of the executive orders forbidding employees of the Post-Office Department to seek redress of grievances through direct appeal to Congress, a large number of the railway postal clerks organized and affiliated with the American Federation of

Labor. This effort was made in order to enlist the assistance of the American Federation of Labor in an effort to secure remedial legislation. A number of these organizations were chartered by the American Federation of Labor. As soon as this became known, the Post-Office Department undertook to destroy them. Men employed in the service were victimized and compelled to seek other employment. Realizing the helplessness of the railway postal clerks, and desiring to render them all the assistance possible, the American Federation of Labor secured the introduction in both Houses of Congress of bills which, if adopted, would nullify the obnoxious executive orders to which reference is here made and restore to all employees of the Government their rights as American citizens.

While these bills did not reach consideration by either House, yet by an amendment to the Post-Office Appropriation bill, which is now a law, the right of petition, a right guaranteed to all citizens, was restored. Representatives of organized men in the classified civil service and in other departments of the Government, may now seek legislative relief from onerous conditions for these employees.

The effect of this amendment to the Post-Office Appropriation bill will be far-reaching and will preclude the possibility of the Post-Office Department assuming that men in the employ of the Government who organize for the protection of their interests, have no right to join the American Federation of Labor. The assumption of the officials of the Post-Office Department that they had the right to designate the organization or organizations of which the employees of the postal department should become members is at variance with the American idea of government. The American Federation of Labor is working out its destiny within the law, and will contest the assumption by Government officials of the right to dictate to the employees of the Government to which organizations they shall or shall not belong. The American people are not yet ready to take the position that because an individual accepts employment from the Government he thereby forfeits the rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution of the United States. . . .

That great English statesman, William Ewart Gladstone, is credited with saying that the Constitution of the United States is the greatest work ever written by the hand of man. The

organized labor movement accepts this as a truism, but it suggests the thought that the Constitution, good as it is, and wonderfully comprehensive as its provisions are, was not expected nor intended by its authors to extend to the people of the United States for all time; neither was it ratified by the people of the several States after presentation to them as the last word in the progress of human government. Indeed, that this is true is evidenced by the provisions in the Constitution itself by which that instrument can be changed.

We, who are the accredited responsible representatives of the producers of our country, take issue with those who, in the language of the gambler, "stand pat," and who refuse to see or expect any thing good in the minds and hearts of the present generation. . . . We must have restored to the people the unrestricted power of changing their statutory or organic laws whenever they find the occasion and necessity warrant it, regardless of whether the "elder statesmen" should term it the "voice of clamor" or "the voice of the mob." As intelligent, aspiring American citizens, we resent such outrageous aspersions as are hurled at us when we urge humane social legislation, judicial restriction, and executive restraint. The safety of society impels us to seek for ourselves the safest and sanest way to preserve our institutions.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Rochester, N. Y., November, 1912.*

In the "twilight zone" of federal and state jurisdiction, it is most difficult to have constructive legislation enforced that shall deal with the industrial affairs of our working people. My experience has been that appearing before the committees of state legislatures to urge reformatory or constructive legislation in the interest of the workers, we are told that after all this industry or commerce is interstate rather than intra-state, and hence jurisdiction of the federal government applies; and then appearing before the committees of congress upon the exact same proposition, we are told that these are matters that are not conceded by the states and hence under the state jurisdiction, and between the two it is a case of shuttlecock and battledore.—*From address before The National Civic Federation, New York, December 15, 1908.*

In establishing the new nation the great statesmen who reared the structure of our republic conceived the idea of providing three separate, distinct and coördinate departments of government, the legislative, the executive and the judicial. Each of these departments was designed to be within itself absolutely independent of the other, exercising supreme and exclusive jurisdiction in its respective sphere, and yet all were intended to be interdependent.

No similar experimentation with government had ever been attempted in other lands. This new plan was born out of the iron law of necessity. It was ideal in form, although somewhat cumbersome in operation when compared with the monarchical form, which it was designed to replace. The cardinal idea, the thought that inspired all, the intent that riveted the attention of those pioneers, was to show the whole world that no one man was or could ever be wise enough or good enough to control the destinies and the welfare of other men. That cardinal point must be clearly understood for a comprehension of the basic principles upon which our republic was founded.

In connection therewith these early pioneers of the new government saw farther than merely exhausting their energies by making protests which were heard around the world; they coupled with those protests one of the most constructive features of self-government. The central thought was that the destinies of the people of the new nation should be left in the hands of the people themselves. For want of better machinery, with which the people might express their will, the old English system of expressing their collective will through representatives, our representative form of government, was established.

For years the fathers wrestled with this great problem of self-government. The spirit that had called forth the sentiments and principles of the Declaration of Independence struggled and contested for a popular government in all that that expression implies. The opposition, fearing to intrust the people with full sway, exerted their greatest efforts to limit the people's power. Yet all agreed upon one point, and that was, that the source of all power, of all new legislation, of every vital principle of law, should rest in the hands of the people through their representatives in Congress; aye, and by a two-thirds vote even over the veto of the President. In short, the Congress, composed of the

House of Representatives and the Senate, was charged specifically under the basic laws contained in the Constitution to make provision for revenues and expenditures, to establish a fiscal system, and above and beyond all to form a code of law, in respect to which the executive and judicial branches of the Government were and are required to yield obedience, these branches on this point being not coördinate, but subordinate. For example, the executive was granted no authority to create law; the judicial department was granted no prerogative to make law; the law was to be made solely and distinctly by the people's representatives in Congress, and then it was designed that the judicial department should administer the law as it found it, and the executive should execute the law as it was clearly written and interpreted.

If present conditions were not so serious, it would appear absurd that at this late day such a restatement of fact and principle should be found necessary. But flagrant departures from the Constitution in the recent past not only justify but compel criticism and protest. When others who should speak are silent, when others are willing to allow the vital principles of self-government to be either misapplied or betrayed, it is time that the men of labor should speak, directing the attention of their fellow-workers and fellow-citizens to the evils that threaten.

One of the greatest dangers now confronting the people and the people's government is the effort to overrule, to disregard, to treat with contempt that part of the Government nearest the people—the House of Representatives. This is not generally understood, but it is a fact nevertheless, and the character and the composition of the House in the last decade are chiefly to blame. For sake of party, of party harmony; for patronage or its possible loss; for the sake of a reëlection, the members have sat idly by, closed their eyes, refused to listen to the voice of duty, until such weakness has culminated in establishing the custom by Representatives of "holding their tongues" for fear they might lose caste with the Speaker whom they periodically and mechanically elected as their servant, yet to whom they have submitted as their master. For fear they might be considered fault-finders, for fear they might be called "irregular," for fear of their non-appointment on important committees, for fear they might lose the patronage the President has to bestow, they have

acted as though paralyzed. Fear! Fear! Fear! Always the ghostly apparition of fear haunts the life of the average Congressman, and while this unAmerican attitude prevails the privileges, the dignity, the unquestioned prerogatives of legislation, the bedrock basis of constitutional rights, the fundamental requirement of fearless, faithful representation that gave this nation birth—these precious, valued, and holy elements of liberty are being gradually alienated from the House of Representatives by the courts and by the Presidents, and all that is now left of the power of the House is a theoretical recognition by the other departments that the House shall "hold the money bag" and provide revenue for the operation and continuation of the Government. That the House has not availed itself of even this power is current history patent to any observer.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.*

The Canadian act recently passed, to regulate and control industrial combines, excludes the organizations of the working people from its operations, and in Great Britain, after the Taff Vale decision was rendered, Parliament, in 1906, passed a law exempting labor organizations from the operations of a similar law. This same exemption the American organized workers have asked at the hands of Congress. . . . To say to us that such suits will not be often brought means nothing. They are a constant menace. To say that the Federal Government will not prosecute under the criminal provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law does not allay our apprehensions. The fact is we decline to exist at the sufferance of any administration, Republican or Democratic, or of any other public body or agency.—*From address at National Civic Federation Conference, January 12, 1911.*

What is any legislation but class legislation or the formulation by one group of people of what they deem a policy in their interests? Few laws are passed by unanimous consent. It follows, then, that tariff legislation is "class legislation" in the interests of manufacturers; that free trade is "class legislation" in the interests of consumers; that our laws protecting "property" are class legislation handed down from the middle ages when the property holding classes controlled the government, made the

laws, and directed their administration. But justice is a relative term and our concept of justice has widened so that the workingman has, in theory at least, risen from slavery to freedom, and human souls and flesh and blood are more than inanimate things! Government and laws have developed from an institution merely by virtue of and for the protection of property, into a medium for attaining social ideals and needs beyond individual realization. . . . Labor is not asking that justice be hampered by weakening the courts, but Labor is demanding that justice shall prevail by removing the abuses and mispractices of the courts. Unlimited, unchecked power vested in autocrat, King, President or judge has always resulted in justice being perverted and tyranny stalking the land.—*American Federationist, November, 1912.*

Whither are we drifting? There is a strange spirit abroad in these times. The whole people is hugging the delusion that law is a panacea. Whatever the ill or the wrong or the ideal, immediately follows the suggestion—enact a law.

If there is no market for cotton, those interested demand a law.

If there is a financial crisis, a law is demanded to protect special interests.

If the desire for physical strength and beauty is aroused, laws for eugenic marriages are demanded.

If men and women speak ill-considered or unwise words, laws that forbid their speaking in that manner are proposed.

If morals are bad, a law is demanded.

If wages are low, a law or a commission is the remedy proposed.

Whether as a result of laziness or incompetency there is a steadily growing disposition to shift responsibility for personal progress and welfare to outside agencies.

What can be the result of this tendency but the softening of the moral fiber of the people? When there is unwillingness to accept responsibility for one's life and for making the most of it there is a loss of strong, red-blooded, rugged independence and will power to grapple with the wrong of the world and to establish justice through the volition of those concerned.

Many of the things for which many are now deludedly demanding legislative regulation should and must be worked out by those concerned. Initiative, aggressive conviction, enlightened

self-interest, are the characteristics that must be dominant among the people if the nation is to make substantial progress toward better living and higher ideals. Legislation can not secure these characteristics but it can facilitate or impede them. Laws can not create and superimpose the ideals sought, they can only free people from the shackles and give them a chance to work out their own salvation.

Many conscientious and zealous persons think that every evil, every mistake, every unwise practice, can be straightway corrected by law.

There is among some critics of prevailing conditions a belief that legislation is a short-cut to securing any desired reform—merely enact a law and the thing is done.

Now enacting a law and securing the realization of the purpose the law is aimed to secure are two vastly different matters. Of the making of many laws there is apparently no end, for legislative and congressional mills yearly grind out thousands. But for the enforcement of these laws there is little effort unless enforcement is demanded by public opinion or by interested groups of citizens. As a rule the laws affect conditions and people little, and society is glad to escape with so little damage.

A law that really is a law, is a result of public thought and conviction and not a power to create thought or conviction. The enforcement of the law follows naturally because the people will it. To enact a law with the hope and for the purpose of educating the people is to proceed by indirection and to waste energy. It is better to begin work for securing ideals by directing activity first for fundamentals. Frequently, when the people concerned become mindful and eager for what will promote their own welfare, they find that they are much more able to secure what will benefit and adapt their methods to changing circumstances than is any law or the administration of that law.

The virile spirit that has given our young nation a foremost place among the nations of the world is the spirit of aggressive initiative and independence, the ability of our people to grapple with hard problems and to solve them for their own benefit and for the benefit of the nation. We must not as a nation allow ourselves to drift upon a policy of excessive regulation by legislation—a policy that eats at and will surely undermine the very foundations of personal freedom.

These principles and facts apply to the working people, the organized wage-earners, as fully and completely as to any other group or to the people as a whole. Labor seeks legislation from the hands of government for such purposes only as the individuals or groups of workers can not effect for themselves, and for the freedom and the right to exercise their normal activities in the industrial and social struggle for the protection and promotion of their rights and interests and for the accomplishment of their highest and best ideals. Thus Labor asks legislation providing for the abolition of child labor; security and safety in life and work; sanitation in factory, shop, mill and home; workmen's compensation in preference to employers' liability; the regulation of convict labor and the like; the enactment of laws such as the proposed seamen's bill and the labor provisions of the Clayton law already enacted; the regulation of the issuance of injunctions and the trials of contempt cases; these latter work for freedom, for right, for justice. These reforms the workers and groups can not secure without law, because they are governmental functions and can not be accomplished by private agencies. In a word, the labor movement undertakes to secure from government, both state and nation, the enactment of laws for the accomplishment of such things as the working people can not secure or enforce for themselves.

We know no better way of illustrating this thought than by quoting the report we made to the Denver (1908) Convention, on economic power, as follows: . . .

In whatever form or shape the men of labor may exercise their energies and activities, in inception and result the effort is for the common uplift of all, though our political activities must of necessity be primarily devoted to acquire for our economic movement its freest and fullest natural development.

Our movement has not asked and will not ask at the hands of government anything which the workers can and should do for themselves. The movement of labor is founded upon the principle that that which we do for ourselves, individually and collectively, is done best. It is therefore that the exercise by the workers of their economic power is after all the greatest and the most potent power which they can wield.

The possession of great economic power does not imply its abuse, but rather its right use. Consciousness and possession of

economic power bring with them responsibility, wisdom, and care in its exercise. These have made the labor movement of our country a tower of strength inspiring the confidence and respect of the masses of our workers as well as the sympathetic support of students, thinkers and liberty-loving people.—*American Federationist, February, 1915.*

Another difficulty with the legislative method is the diffusion of effort. There are comparatively few people interested in the matter, and yet the whole body politic must be interested, educated and roused to action.

Contrast this with the simple, direct methods of economic action. Those workers who want the shorter workday know why they want it, and they want it so intensely that they are ready to fight for it. Forceful independent men and women, they assume the responsibility of their own welfare and make sacrifices to secure their rights. By agreement or by strike, they secure what they need, and because they have won it themselves they value it and maintain it. They are organized in such a way that they can give expression to their will and secure results in the most direct way possible.—*American Federationist, March, 1915.*

National policies, whether political or military, must be in accord with broad democratic ideals that recognize all factors and value each according to the service that it performs. There is a human side to all of our national problems, whether industrial, commercial, political, or military. It has been the general practice of governments to accord only to employers, the owners of capital, of the managerial side of commerce and industry, real participation in government and in deciding upon governmental policies. According to this custom the wage earners belong to the class of the governed, never to the governing class. This policy is a reflection of conditions existing in the industrial and commercial world. However, a change has been coming. The wage earners, through their economic associations, have been making the demand that those who supply the creative labor power of industry and commerce are surely as important to the processes of production as those who supply the materials necessary for production. They have, therefore, made demand that

the human side of production shall at least be given as much consideration and as much importance as the material side. They demand that industry and commerce shall be conducted not only in the interests of production but with consideration for the welfare and the conservation of the human beings employed in production.—*From address at annual meeting of The National Civic Federation in Washington, D. C., January 18, 1916.*

The American labor movement has made a clear differentiation between government workers and private employment, holding that in private employment the strike is the last resort, while in government employment legislation is the final remedy. Organization and affiliation with other organizations that can secure redress of grievances is the safety valve for any industrial or commercial undertaking. The same principle holds in government utility. . . . To deny the right of workers in our largest governmental agency to organize is to make a mockery of our faith in democracy. If autocracy is harmful to the morals of our alien enemies abroad, then let us not introduce a species of it into our largest federal institution by attempting to disfranchise industrially the army of postal workers.

At a time when governmental activities are being extended into every industry connected with the successful prosecution of the war and thousands of workers are either already in the government service or potentially government employees, it is important that their right to organize and to petition Congress be not interfered with. We can conceive of nothing more harmful to the necessary extension of government control and regulation at this time than the adoption of the Burleson idea by our government in its capacity of employer.—*American Federationist, January, 1918.*

RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

Pray let us consider of what do fundamental rights consist? As I understand it, the right to life; that is, the right to protect one's life; the right to defend one's life; the right that life and liberty shall not be placed in jeopardy without due process of law; the right to liberty; the exercise of man's natural desires to do that which brings to him the greatest amount of comfort; to

the expression of his judgment; to do that which appears to him to be right and that which shall not unlawfully invade the lawful rights of another; the pursuit of happiness; the right to do anything and everything that is not unlawful to secure the greatest degree of happiness.—*From hearing before Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, January 13-March 22, 1904. on bill to limit meaning of the word "conspiracy."*

Rights? Yes, there is no hesitancy on the part of our courts to grant us certain rights—for instance, the right to be maimed or killed without any responsibility to the employer; the right to be discharged for belonging to a union of labor; the right to work as long hours and for as low wages as the employer can impose upon the working man or woman. These rights—these academic rights, which we do not want—are freely conceded, but there is the denial to us of the rights which are essential to our welfare. . . .

Ours is not the first republic in the world. There are older republics now in existence. There was that great republic of Rome, which went into decay. There are some who imagine that the republic of Rome went by the board over night, that it was simply swept out of existence like a thunderbolt from a clear sky. In truth, for many and many years the process of disintegration went on; first, in the denial of a certain liberty or right to a certain portion of the people, and the granting of privileges and franchises to another portion of the people—for it is in the nature of things that as soon as the denial of rights is proceeded with in the one instance it is accompanied by the bestowal of extra privileges upon another class. So, by filching the liberties of the people, one by one; tranquilizing one and trying to satisfy others—by this process the very essentials of liberty, character, independence, thoughtfulness and manfulness were taken out of the hearts of the Roman people until a mere shell of the republic existed. The people of Rome no longer had any interest in the maintenance or the perpetuation of what was then called a republic. There was no incentive for its defense in the hearts and minds of the people, and, hence, no wonder that it fell an easy prey to a handful of invading barbarians.

So, I ask you, men and women of toil, and you, men and women in other vocations of life, to look around you and see

what is transpiring. Is it not enough to cause us to pause and ask ourselves whither are we drifting? The courts are denying to the toilers the privileges—no, no; not privileges; the rights which are inherently and naturally theirs. . . .

The wealth possessors are free wherever they go, and I will not begrudge them their freedom. All we insist upon is being free ourselves. There is no power or factor so potent to maintain the freedom that we now possess, and to obtain absolute equality before the law and equality of opportunity as the labor organizations of our time. . . . It is our purpose to see to it that this country shall be not alone a haven of civil and religious liberty, based upon the spirit of 1776, of 1861, the spirit that went to make Cuba free, as well as the movement that cut the shackles from 4,000,000 black slaves; the spirit of Patrick Henry; the spirit of Lincoln. The spirit is not dead, and we propose to help in making this country of ours the home of industrial freedom, the three links of civil liberty, religious equality and opportunity, and industrial freedom, and under God's guidance, moving onward and forward, establishing the dream of the poet—the brotherhood of man.—*From address at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1908.*

Essential to the welfare and independence of the masses is the free exercise of certain of their rights and powers in the economic field. This truth becomes clear to our minds when we consider it as applied to the individual possessing those rights and powers. Let a man have the right to decide when he is to work or is not to work, and let that decision be backed by his power to keep himself from being obliged by immediate necessity to offer his labor to an employer, and the consequence must be that he will not sell his labor-power until the terms offered him are the best that the industry can warrant. Similarly, when a number of associated persons may freely decide as to whether they shall work or not, and uphold that decision, they have in their hands the economic power to secure to themselves from the products of industry a share restricted only by industrial success.

In the mere statement of the conditions indicated by my words there are suggested the reasons why Labor is compelled in present

circumstances to engage in the political struggle. It is, in a word, in order to set itself free.

Labor is bound by the fetters of unjust laws. It is Labor's task to break those fetters one by one. The first to be removed are necessarily those which are the most painful, binding, and destructive of Labor's rights and powers.

There must in justice be no law, formulated by judge or lawmaker, which can deprive a wage-worker of his own exclusive ownership of himself, or, in other words, of those rights over his own labor-power which are guaranteed by the Constitution and the concepts of liberty implied in the fundamental principles of our Republic.

There must be no law which can deprive the laborer of his right over his power to purchase or to refrain from purchasing whatever is legitimately on sale in the community.

There must be an end to the untenable doctrine that a right pertaining to an individual singly becomes a wrong when exercised by him in combination with other individuals legally enjoying the same right singly.

These examples illustrate points at which the labor movement comes into contact with politics, since only by force of lawmaking can present laws be abrogated or the limits of lawmaking itself be outlined.

As the defense of rights, manifestly varying in their scope with respect to men, women, and children, and in times of peace or war, is the legitimate domain of government, so the defense of those rights which peculiarly bear upon the wage-worker is inevitably the especial concern of the labor movement. I am impressed with the conviction, however, that with the free exercise of the rights which will leave untrammeled the regular and recognized functions of trade unionism, the workers of this country will move forward by leaps and bounds to a general condition of unexampled welfare. With those rights in full play they will be possessed of the economic power to enable themselves to push forward to greater successes, to justice, freedom and a better humanity, the goal of Labor's aspirations.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.*

THE COURTS AND LABOR INJUNCTIONS

When an injunction has been issued restraining any person from doing a certain thing, say, building a house, tearing down a house, invading land, or anything else, and in the event that it transpires during the trial of the case in court that the injunction was wrongly applied for or mistakenly granted, the party who secured the injunction may be mulcted in damages, and thus remedy the wrong inflicted upon the party enjoined. But, if men are engaged in a strike either to prevent a reduction in wages or to secure an advance, or who have been locked out by their employers, whether they were previously united or become organized by reason of the controversy, and these men are enjoined from doing what every other citizen has the right to do, that is, to unite, to counsel, to advise, to communicate, and use every needful and lawful means within their power, and they are enjoined from doing those things by the court, that injunction simply means that these men are dispersed. No suit, no case at law can remedy the wrong that is inflicted upon the men thus enjoined. Their protest, their uniting to redress a wrong or a grievance, have been destroyed.—*From hearing before Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, March 23, 1900, on bill to limit meaning of the word "conspiracy."*

But what is the position of the judge? [Buffalo machinists' strike.] Here is the language he is reported as having used in his charge:

"The union had a right, if a man obnoxious to them was employed, to withdraw, and they had a right to fix wages and hours of work, but they had no right to force this man out of his position."

Study this remarkable utterance with care. Is it possible to reconcile the admission that "the union had a right to withdraw" if a man obnoxious to them was employed with the statement that they had "no right to force this man out of his position?" How did the union force the plaintiff out? By threatening "to withdraw," that is, to strike, for they can not suppose the court to be guilty of juggling with the word "withdraw." When a union strikes it withdraws, and, conversely, when it withdraws it strikes. Now, if the union had a right to strike, it certainly

had the right to warn or threaten the employer that a strike would be ordered if he did not discharge the obnoxious man. This is all the union did. It threatened a strike, as it had a right to do. The employer, confronted with the necessity of choosing between the defendant and the members of the union, elected to dismiss the former, as he had a legal and moral right to do. The plaintiff thus lost his position, was "forced out" by the threat of the union to withdraw. It is a well-known saying in logic that "he who intends the cause intends the consequences of it." The forcing out was the consequence of the legitimate threat to withdraw. What kind of logic is it which says that a union has a right to strike when an obnoxious man is employed, but has no right to get rid of the obnoxious man by threatening to strike? . . . There is no escape from the conclusion that the court denied the right of the union to order or threaten a strike as a means of securing the discharge of an obnoxious person, nullifying and violating his own admission that a strike for such a purpose, or any other, is lawful. If this be disputed, let the fair-minded man ask himself what other course was open to the union if it was determined not to work with the obnoxious man —what other way it had to exercise its "right to withdraw."

Suppose the union had withdrawn without assigning any reason, and suppose the employer had requested an explanation of the strike. Would not the union have had the right to name the cause—the presence of the obnoxious person? No one can answer this in the negative. There is no principle of law or morals forbidding strikers to state the cause of their action. Now, suppose the union had stated the reason, and the employer had then, in order to get the union men back, discharged the man. Would not the union have forced him out of his position by the strike? Is there any difference between the case supposed and the actual case?

The Buffalo court, by its ruling, attacked the right to strike —a right it acknowledged in terms and trampled upon in the direction to the jury to assess damages. The ruling is against the spirit of the New York law. It is a direct and plain violation of the right to strike.—*From hearing before Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, March 26, 1900, on bill to limit meaning of the word "conspiracy."*

We are told of the law and the defense of the law and the opinions of courts. I asked a moment ago whether these decisions have always been final and binding for all time, and we ask our friend whether he remembers—perhaps it was a little before his time—but whether he remembers a decision rendered by the United States Supreme Court famously and popularly known as the Dred Scott decision, the decision which made it unlawful for any man in New York to keep a certain other man simply because he was black and came from Virginia, or any other southern part of the country where slavery existed. Don't you know that the court declared that the man who gave shelter to an escaped slave in the south was guilty of a great crime, and one man whose memory still lives and will live, and whose spirit is marching on and on—John Brown—incurred the ill will of those in authority and helped to rescue some of the slaves, for which he gave up his life upon the gibbet, but he lives in the hearts of his countrymen, and will live so long as the spirit of liberty and right prevails. The law as defined and decided by the United States Supreme Court was not final nor binding, and now there is no lawyer in the entire profession who claims some degree of knowledge of the law and who expects some clients in his profession, who would undertake to justify that decision of the United States Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, no court in the whole United States now refers to the Dred Scott decision of the United States Supreme Court, excepting in censure or ridicule.—*From address at Boston Convention of the A. F. of L., December, 1903.*

You, gentlemen, all members of the legal profession, know that when applications for injunctions are made, practically the judge sitting in court is not in a position to hear any argument upon an application for an injunction or to have the time to read the application itself; that, taking the word of the attorney and the petitioners, who put up a bond for the purpose of carrying out, or indemnifying the defendants, the judge upon ex parte statement directs that the temporary injunction be issued, and usually made returnable, as I said, a long time after the issuance. Now, the men are served with these injunctions, and while some crimes are alleged, the allegations taper off until they reach the most inoffensive person and the most inoffensive acts.

The men necessarily are compelled to either violate or evade the terms of the injunction; and, when arrested and brought before the court, they are charged, not with committing any crime or any offense against the laws, but with having violated the injunctions. There is no confronting the defendant with any one who alleges any crime, no jury of his peers to hear and determine guilt or innocence of alleged unlawful conduct; but the judge who, without the full knowledge of the contents and the purport of the petition for an injunction, issued upon ex parte statements, signs the order enjoining certain things, and because these things, however innocent they may be, have been violated, the man is necessarily guilty of the violation of the terms of the injunction, and is punished, fined, or imprisoned, as the case may be. I contend, gentlemen, that in their language the injunctions, all of them, are more or less, to a larger or lesser degree, impositions upon the courts. . . .

These injunctions are usually made returnable in three, four, or five weeks after the injunction has been issued. I have one of the injunctions here, which shows that it was issued some time during the early part of summer and made returnable in November, and the one to which I have just called your attention is not made returnable at all for any hearing.

And before the time expires when these writs are returnable for hearing either one of two things has occurred; either the strike is lost and the injunctions are made permanent, or the strike is won or compromised, and usually one of the conditions of such agreement and settlement between employer and employees is that the legal phase of the question shall be dropped. But what occurs? The record shows that that injunction has been issued and made returnable for a certain day, and when that day comes around and it is not vacated, it is made permanent by default.

On injunctions in West Virginia a number of men were sentenced to six months; others to a lesser period of imprisonment. And it is not only the imprisonment by reason of the injunction; it is the consciousness on the part of the employers as well as that on the part of the employees that that power exists, and it is held as a menacing weapon over the head of the working people.

We have enough to contend against (in the power that is now possessed by the employers) to maintain our wages and to main-

tain our hours of labor and our conditions of employment. We have enough to contend against in order to come to some understanding and agreement in the bargaining for the sale of our labor without having the Federal Government and its courts to interpose and throw its great influence against us in the balance.

Between the time of the issuance of the injunction and the time it is made returnable the strike is either lost or won.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the injunctions do not reach rioters; they do not reach lawbreakers, and it is not intended by those that seek them that they shall; nor do they entertain the idea that they can reach them. The injunctions are issued restraining an officer of an organization, and a few others necessarily put in there in order to establish a prima facie case of conspiracy, enjoining the officers from issuing orders as directed by the men themselves, from giving advice for which the officer or officers may have been particularly selected, from giving information that has been gathered by direction of the men, from promulgating the result of a vote in which the men participated.

And let me say, gentlemen, that the officers of an organization of labor who have served any considerable period of time as officers, having the responsibility that comes from defeat, seek by every means within their power to avert and avoid contest and conflict. It is not true, the charge that is so often made against the labor leader, so called, of inciting strikes and contests and conflicts, in order, as our opponents put it, to earn our salaries.

The men who are most successful in the movements of labor, in having the confidence and good will and respect of their fellow-workmen, are the men who have done most to avert and avoid strikes. And I call your attention to the very well-known men in the labor movements of our country for an attestation of that fact and the proof of it. I do not pretend to say that here and there you will not find some cracked-brained, irresponsible, and, perhaps, some faithless men; but I ask you to point to any other vocation or profession of life in which you will not find the same character and the same quality of men.—*From testimony before Committee on Labor, House of Representatives, February 11, 1904, on bill for eight hours on government work.*

It may not be amiss here to say that in all these proceedings . . . no element of personal malice or ill-will enters. Labor is

earnestly desirous of entering into friendly relations with employers. . . .

In making these statements we are not indulging in unjustifiable or disrespectful criticism of the judge who issued this injunction. We assume that he acted in accordance with the dictates of his conscience and his best judgment.

One point we have been making for years in regard to other injunctions is equally applicable to this case. We contend that the *power* to issue injunctions involving personal rights and liberties *should not be left to the discretion of any judge* no matter how wise, how discreet, or how learned.

President Roosevelt in his recent message to Congress made the following comment on the abuse of the injunction power:

"Instances of abuses in the granting of injunctions in labor disputes continue to occur, and the resentment in the minds of those who feel that their rights are being invaded and their liberty of action and of speech unwarrantably restrained continues likewise to grow. Much of the attack on the use of the process of injunction is wholly without warrant; but I am constrained to express the belief that for some of it there is warrant. This question is becoming more and more one of prime importance, and unless the courts will themselves deal with it in effective manner, it is certain ultimately to demand some form of legislative action. It would be most unfortunate for our social welfare, if we should permit many honest and law-abiding citizens to feel that they had just cause for regarding our courts with hostility. I earnestly commend to the attention of the Congress this matter, so that some way may be devised which will limit the abuse of injunctions and protect those rights which from time to time it unwarrantably invades. Moreover, discontent is often expressed with the use of the process of injunction by the courts, not only in labor disputes, but where state laws are concerned."

American Federationist, February, 1908.

In any species of legislation that is intended to be helpful, of a constructive character, to bring amelioration into conditions of the workers, compromise is possible. You can not get a whole loaf, and therefore wisdom dictates that something shall be accepted. Time will give the opportunity to build upon it and construct the species of legislation that shall be generally helpful. In legislation by injunction no such compromise can take place. If labor concedes that the court has the right to issue injunctions that are never issued of the same character against any other citizen or man in the community, then, we must for-

ever hold our peace for we have given away our case.—*From hearing before Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, on "Government Investigation of Railway Disputes," February 24, 1908.*

We regard the members of the supreme bench as upright and incorruptible. We believe that in any decision handed down each judge honestly and conscientiously gives the opinion which he believes to be correct. We do not agree with those who charge the court with being influenced by sinister motives, or under the domination of corporate influence. . . .

We are proud of the institutions of our country and try to uphold them with all our power, but *we do protest against the assumption of law-making power by the courts.* In assuming such functions they invade the sphere of the legislative and executive, which must necessarily result injuriously to the very fabric of our republic. Such action by the courts not being contemplated by the constitution there are no safeguards, no checks, as to what may be attempted. This assumption of power, even under the guise of construing existing law, is none the less dangerous, for *the decision of the court then becomes a law without the people ever having had an opportunity to take any part in the making or rejecting of it.—American Federationist, March, 1908.*

I want to read for information from the British Trades Dispute Act. It will not occupy more than two or three minutes. The act was passed by Parliament in December, 1906:

1. It shall be lawful for any person or persons acting either on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or other association of individuals, registered or unregistered, in contemplation of or during the continuance of any trade dispute, to attend for any of the following purposes at or near a house or place where a person resides or works, or carries on his business, or happens to be (1) for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information; (2) for the purpose of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.

2. An agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be ground for an action, if such act when committed by one person would not be ground for an action.

3. An action shall not be brought against a trade union or other association aforesaid for the recovery of damage sustained by any per-

son or persons by reason of the action of a member or members of such trade union or other association aforesaid.

From testimony at hearing before the House Judiciary Committee, April 4, 1908.

Your honor, I am not conscious at any time during my life of having violated any law of the country or of the District in which I live. I would not consciously violate a law now or at any time during my whole life. It is not possible that under the circumstances in which I am before your honor this morning, and after listening to the opinion you have rendered, to either calmly or appropriately express that which I have in mind to say; but, sir, I may be permitted to say this, that the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press has not been granted to the people in order that they may say the things which please, and which are based upon accepted thought, *but the right to say the things which displease,* the right to say the things which may convey the new and yet unexpected thoughts, the right to say things, even though they do a wrong, for one can not be guilty of giving utterance to any expression which may do a wrong if he is by an injunction enjoined from so saying. It then will devolve upon a judge upon the bench to determine in advance a man's right to express his opinion in speech and in print. . . .

That which your honor has quoted and criticized and denounced in us, in the exercise of our duties to our fellows in our own country *is now the statute law of Great Britain,* passed by the parliament of that country less than two years ago. If in monarchical England these rights can be accorded to the working people, these subjects of the monarch, they ought not to be denied to the, theoretically at least, free citizens of a republic. . . .

I say this to you, your honor, I would not have you to believe me to be a man of defiant character, in disposition, in conduct. Those who know me, and know me best, know that that is not my makeup; but in the pursuit of honest convictions, conscious of having violated no law, and in furtherance of the common interests of my fellowmen I shall not only have to but be willing to submit to whatever sentence your honor may impose.—*From statement of Samuel Gompers in Supreme Court of the District*

of Columbia, December 23, 1908, before imposition of sentence by Justice Wright, in contempt proceedings.

Let us consider the position of a defendant who is charged with crime as contrasted with the position of a defendant who is charged with violating an injunction. The man who is charged with crime may have murdered his own mother, he may have strangled his own child, he may have outraged the chastity of a pure woman; and yet this monster is under the law entitled to the presumption of innocence until he has by due process of law, been adjudged guilty. He is guaranteed a trial by an impartial jury of his peers; if he believes and states that the judge of the court is prejudiced against him, he may demand and secure a change of venue and be tried before the judge of another court. Indeed, it is not unusual for a man of this character to have his trial in some other vicinity than the one in which the crime was committed; and even though he be guilty of the crime charged against him, every extenuating circumstance is counted in his favor. If he is without means the court will appoint counsel to defend him. He must, in the course of his trial, be confronted by his accusers, and upon them and upon the state rests the burden of proving the charge against him.

The man who is charged with violating an injunction may be and often is a peaceful, patriotic, law-abiding citizen whose life is devoted to the amelioration of the condition of the weak and the helpless. On the application of some unfair corporation which is oppressing its employees, an injunction is issued restraining this man from the performance of duties that are not of themselves in violation of any constitutional or statutory law. This man is charged with violating some provision of the injunction. He is thereupon commanded to appear in court and show cause why he should not be adjudged guilty and punished. Unlike the murderer who is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty, *this defendant is presumed to be guilty until he can prove his own innocence.* He is denied a trial by a jury of his peers; *he is not confronted by his accusers;* he can not secure a change of venue; he must be tried by the judge whose dignity has been offended, or at the best by an associate judge of the same court; he has no protection against either the bias or the

animus of the court; he is at the mercy of a judge who may or may not be disinterested, judicial, or dignified.

Says the *law* to the defendant: "You are presumed to be innocent until, after a fair and impartial trial, you are adjudged guilty by a jury of your fellow-citizens."

Says the *injunction* to the defendant: "You are presumed to be guilty until you can prove your own innocence. You are commanded to appear before the offended court to show cause why you should not be sent to jail. . . ."

Some carping critics have said, "why not obey the terms of the injunction until the courts of last resort shall have rendered their decision?"

We answer that such a course was absolutely impossible. It would have perverted and suppressed the lawful proceedings of a convention of the American Federation of Labor, a lawful gathering and body. It would have conceded the surrender of the principles of freedom of speech and of the press. It would have deprived the men of labor of the right of calling the wrong to the attention of the people, aye, it would have prevented the men of labor even from making an appeal to Congress or from giving the grounds or furnishing the arguments upon which they base their claims for congressional relief. It must be remembered that the defendants, their friends, sympathizers, agents and attorneys *were enjoined from mentioning directly or indirectly, in printing, in writing, or by word of mouth,* the original grievance, *the original contention, the injunction, or anything in connection therewith.*

But let us see whether the contentions of the critics to whom we refer are justified. A case in point is recalled. About twenty-one years ago the city council of Lincoln, Nebr., was investigating charges made against a police magistrate. The attorneys for the police magistrate secured a temporary suspension of the investigation and before the investigation was resumed, secured from Judge Brewer, then on the circuit bench of the United States, an order restraining the city council from the removal of the offending official. The restraining order was made returnable at a date about two months away. If the council had obeyed the injunction, considerable time would have elapsed, and then if the temporary injunction had been made permanent, an appeal

would have been taken, and by the time the magistrate's term had expired a final decision might not have been secured. The mayor and council, convinced that Judge Brewer's injunction interfered with the constitutional rights of the city authorities, continued to perform their duties, made the investigation, and removed the official. Judge Brewer cited these officers for contempt, imposed a fine of $600 on some and $50 on two others. The condemned men, with only one exception, refused to pay the fine and were sent to prison. An appeal was taken to the circuit court of the United States, which decided that Judge Brewer exceeded his authority in issuing the injunction and declared it void—that is, the defendants acted within their rights in refusing to obey the order. The defendants were thereupon discharged. The one member of the council, who, because of ill health paid the fine rather than go to jail, was reimbursed by an appropriation made by the Congress of the United States (United States Court Reports, "ex parte; in the matter of Andrew J. Sawyer et al., petitioners," volume 124, page 200).

Let us briefly quote other authorities. Here is one of great importance.

"A party can not be adjudged guilty of contempt for disobeying an order which the court had no power to make." (People *vs.* O'Neill, 47 Cal., 109; Ex parte Thatcher, 7 Ill., 1671; Walton *vs.* Develing, 61 Ill., 201; Lester *vs.* People, 150 Ill., 408; 41 L. R. A., 375; Ex parte Grace, 12 Iowa; 79 Am. Dec., 529.)—*From editorial in American Federationist, February, 1909, on Justice Wright's decision.*

Justice Wright recently issued a writ to a joint House and Senate committee of Congress requiring the committeemen to show cause why a mandamus should not be issued by him to compel them to pursue a certain course. The committees reported to their respective houses. The Senate refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the court to inquire into the acts of its committee, and so notified Justice Wright. The House of Representatives decided to recognize the court's jurisdiction, and its committee appeared before the court. . . .

If ever men placed themselves in contempt of court, the committee of the Senate and afterward all the Senators, placed

themselves in that position, and yet what has Justice Wright done with these contemners? The mere fact that he later dismissed the writ does not change the situation one jot. If he had the authority and the jurisdiction to issue the writ, the Senators were bound to obey and in refusing to obey they were in contempt. If they were in contempt, why does he not exercise his power and summon them before him for their refusal to obey his mandate?

Justice Wright has not hesitated or failed to hale other men before him for alleged contempt of court, to punish and sentence them to long terms of imprisonment, when merely standing on their long-acknowledged rights as citizens. Why should he hesitate in the case of United States Senators? The reply is that he realizes that if he attempted to bring the Senators before his bar for contempt, it would raise a storm of indignation and resentment throughout the country. The courts' invasion of the domain of the legislators, as well as the domain of the constitutional rights of the citizen, would be thrashed out in such a manner as would bring the entire issue of judicial usurpation to the forefront to be settled, and settled right.—*American Federationist, April, 1910.*

In itself the writ of injunction is of a highly important and beneficent character. Its aims and purposes are for the protection of property rights. It never was intended, and never should be invoked, for the purpose of depriving free men of their personal rights, the right of man's ownership of himself; the right of free locomotion, free assemblage, free association, free speech, free press; the freedom to do those things promotive of life, liberty and happiness, and which are not in contravention of the law of our land. We reassert that we ask no immunity for ourselves or for any other man who may be guilty of any unlawful or criminal act; but we have a right to insist, and we do insist, that when a workman is charged with a crime or any unlawful conduct he shall be accorded every right, be apprehended, charged, and tried by the same process of law and before a jury of his peers, equally with any other citizen of our country. It is agreed by all, friends and opponents alike, that the injunction process, beneficent in its inception and general practice, never should apply and legally can not be applied where there is another ample remedy at law.—*American Federationist, July, 1910.*

We must reassert an old truth in a new way, and herald it broadcast: The courts are made for the people, and not the people for the courts.

Let me close these observations on this vital subject by quoting a guarantee contained in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780:

"In the government of this Commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them; to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men."

That declaration contains the whole pith of genuine representative republican government. If the Congress and the courts and the executive had observed these first principles there would not now be any need of protest on this issue from the men of labor, who, by reason of their position in and relation to society, must of necessity be the defenders and standard-bearers of true freedom.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.*

In self-defense, labor and its officials have in times past been compelled to criticize judicial action. For this course our spokesmen have been censured in unmeasured terms. But we are no longer singled out for targets by the subsidized organs of the privileged. The list of critics of the judiciary now includes the best thought, the best talent, and the best character of the nation. . . . No leader of labor in all this land ever so fiercely or successfully attacked a court as did Mr. Justice Harlan. I say successfully, because among the hundreds of lawyers and statesmen who have expressed themselves with respect to the decisions in the oil and tobacco cases few have understood the trend and significance of these decisions as did Justice Harlan, that is to say, as a menace to the very life of the Republic and as a usurpation of legislative power. Even such newspapers as usually assume the task of defending the courts in all circumstances have either remained silent or have evasively and feebly replied to the court's critics.

Here are some of Justice Harlan's words:

"In order that my objections to certain parts of the court's opinion may distinctly appear, I must state the circumstances under which Congress passed the anti-trust act and trace the course of judicial decisions as to its meaning and scope. This is the more necessary be-

cause the court by its decision, when interpreted by the language of its opinion, has not only upset the long settled interpretation of the act, but has usurped the constitutional functions of the legislative branch of the Government."

Then, after a review of the history of the act and of the prior decisions thereunder, he thus proceeds:

"It remains for me to refer, more fully than I have heretofore done, to another, and in my judgment, if we look to the future, the most important aspect of this case. That aspect concerns THE USURPATION BY THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT. The illustrious men who laid the foundations of our institutions deemed no part of the national Constitution of more consequence or more essential to the permanency of our form of government than the provisions under which were distributed the powers of government among three separate, equal and coördinate departments—legislative, executive, and judicial. This was at that time a new feature of governmental regulation among the nations of the earth, and it is deemed by the people of every section of our own country as most vital in the workings of a representative republic, whose Constitution was ordained and established in order to accomplish the objects stated in its preamble, by the means, but only by the means, provided, either expressly or by necessary implication, by the instrument itself. No department of that Government can constitutionally exercise the powers committed strictly to another and separate department."

Justice Harlan, in the course of his opinion, made a prediction that the majority decision would "throw the business of the country into confusion and invite widely extended and harassing litigation, the injurious effects of which will be felt for many years to come." How literally and exactly his predictions have been fulfilled all know. We are in a position now to extend heartfelt sympathies to business men, for we have known for years what it was to have our rights so unsettled by court "decrees" that we knew not where we stood or what next to expect. . . .

How great the obstacles interposed by courts have been to the organization of labor, and to the exercise of the fundamental legal rights of trade unionists, may be inferred from the number of injunctions petitioned for and the number granted in the course of a decade. As in the State of Massachusetts, from 1898 to 1908, employers petitioned for injunctions in sixty-six cases, and injunctions were actually issued in forty-six, it may be estimated that the entire number granted throughout the United States in that time reached not less than a thousand. The damage to trade union effort lies not only in the injunctions actually

issued, but also on occasions in the partial paralysis of union activity because of the threat of injunctions by employers and because of the aggressions of police authorities acting on the assumption that injunctions already granted give them extraordinary powers in case of strikes or lockouts.

Now, what are the rights claimed by the trade unionists which have been interfered with by the courts? The trade unionist asserts, first of all, that his labor power is his own, to be exercised or not, according to his own will. He asserts, as well, that his purchasing power is his own, to be applied, with respect to all things legitimately on sale, according to his own discretion and judgment. The trade unionist's right to the so-called "primary" boycott has been recognized by the higher courts in the country, and he asserts the same right in every successive application he deems fit to make of it. A trade unionist further holds that his union is legal; that it has a right to exclude unqualified workmen from membership; that its rules and by-laws are an element in determining the legitimacy of a strike. He holds that it is not unlawful to attempt to peacefully persuade persons not to enter or remain in the employment of any one against whom a strike is being carried on. He, of course, holds that a strike is lawful when directed against an employer with whom the striking workmen have a direct dispute with regard to wages or conditions of labor for the purpose of obtaining a betterment of these conditions. He also holds that no restraining order or injunction should be issued by any court as against striking or locked-out employees which would not be issued against other citizens and not even against workers who were not engaged in a strike or lockout with employers. He holds that an injunction rightfully lies to protect from injury property or a property right of the party making the application for which injury there is no adequate remedy at law, such property or property right to be described in detail in the application. He holds that no right to continue the relation of employer and employee can lawfully be construed as property. He holds that it can not lawfully be regarded as a conspiracy for two or more persons to agree concerning the terms or conditions of employment of labor or the determination of any relation between employer and employee, nor concerning any act to be done or not to be done with reference to a labor dispute, unless the act or thing agreed to be done

or not to be done would be unlawful if done by a single individual.

The trade unionists hold that in case of lockout or strike, their representatives, in their rightful enjoyment of the common property of the community, may go about anywhere in the public highways just as may be done by other citizens—no more, no less. They hold that they have a right to approach persons in the public highway and in a peaceful manner converse with them for the purpose of informing them of actual conditions, facts, and circumstances in regard to labor disputes, and if possible inducing them not to enter into or not to continue in the service of an employer. In all cases trade unionists regard a trial by jury as a fundamental right of a citizen charged with an offense against the laws. They are prepared at all times to maintain as a primary principle that courts should be restrained from enjoining members of a union, as they are restrained from enjoining other citizens, from exercising the rights of free speech and of a free press.

Often have decrees and decisions issued by the lower courts been revised and modified by the higher courts. Nearly all labor officials of experience are to-day acquainted with the clearly illegal character of those decrees of the lower courts which have often been eliminated, at least partially, by their superiors or have been refused by other courts, their equals. Whereas, for example, peaceful "picketing" and "patrolling" are frequently forbidden by one court, they are upheld by another. The same is true of approaching non-unionists on the streets, or, in the words of an injunction, "interfering with any person or persons who now are or may hereafter be in the employment of the complainant or desirous of entering the same," etc. Likewise as to union action, or, in legal parlance, "any scheme or conspiracy among unionists for the purpose of preventing persons from continuing in the employ of certain employers." Unionists have been enjoined from "following any products of the plaintiff's business for the purpose of learning what person or persons have purchased such products;" "or in any way interfering with the conduct of business by the plaintiff as now carried on by him," etc., etc.

All such indefinite and far-reaching inhibitions find no legitimate place in injunctions. They are a perversion of the intent and purposes of the injunctive writ. If any trade unionist should

be guilty of violating any law, we ask no immunity for him; we insist that the course to be pursued by justice is arrest, indictment, and trial by jury.

It is time that the unjustifiable peremptory charges, browbeating, censures, and threats of fines and imprisonment by injunction judges should cease.

It is time for the laboring people to know precisely how far their rights carry them when facing courts in labor disputes.

We have been assured by high judicial authority that "the modern writ of injunction is used for purposes which bear no more resemblance to the ancient writ of that name than the milky way bears to the sun." Judges have not only restrained and punished the alleged commission of crimes defined by statute, but they have proceeded to frame a criminal code of their own, extended as they have seen proper, by which various acts innocent in law and morals have been made criminal. The tendency of the jurisdiction of the "equitable octopus called injunction," has been to "grow and extend perpetually and unceasingly."

The people of this country have witnessed, in the course of a celebrated injunction case, how it has dragged on until years have been consumed, how the trade unions have been subjected through it to extraordinary expenditures, and how the injunction which began it has been used during all that time as a menace to prevent the proper and rightful activities of workers.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlanta, Ga., November, 1911.*

Since the enactment of the labor provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act federal courts have ceased to issue injunctions in industrial disputes and no more attempts have been made to dissolve or penalize trade unions under antitrust laws. Efforts to interfere with the activities of trade unions and to destroy the effectiveness of labor organizations have not ceased, but operations have been transferred to state courts. In many states injunctions have increased in number and in viciousness of purpose. From this is apparent the necessity for the declaration of the A. F. of L. that the provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act in the federal field must be supplemented by similar protective and remedial legislation under state jurisdiction.—*American Federationist, July, 1916.*

IV.

LABOR'S STAND ON PUBLIC ISSUES

IMMIGRATION

The time was when the American people could declare that the United States should be a haven for the oppressed of all nations and invite all who desired to seek a new home to come to our shores. At that time the industries of our country were entirely in their infancy, our lands were undeveloped, our resources greater than we even knew. The people who came did so of their own volition, they cast their fortunes with those already here, harmonized and blended with them. To-day, however, there is not an industry which is not overcrowded with working people who vainly plead for an opportunity to work. This is not only confined to the factories, workshops, mills, mines and stores; the same complaint can be heard arising from the farm lands, and all join in one mighty cry that relief must come.

On the other hand we see artificial famines in some of the older countries caused by the vast holdings of the titled wealthy class. While the masses starve the tyrannical autocrats and effete monarchs bolster up their miserable dynasties by forcing immigration, while their willing tools furnish the means to aid them out of their respective countries, and as they cannot go to many other countries in Europe, and owing to the laxity of public spirit and a recognition of the dangers that threaten us, they are literally "dumped" upon our shores. There are societies formed for that special purpose, who forward at least ten thousand emigrants each month, and again the ship companies by the wiles known to the cunning speculator, improperly stimulate unnecessary and unhealthy immigration.

Then again, great corporations, in violation of the law enter into written and implied contracts for servile labor to crowd and compete with the employed and large masses of unemployed

working people in our country. To crown the wrong some of the officers of the United States Government charged with the enforcement of the law to prevent improper immigration, showed a lack of sympathy with the law, connived at its violation, and sought to bring the whole law into ridicule and contempt. Quite recently, spurred on by organized labor, a better effort is made to enforce the law.

There are ways and means by which, without bigotry, narrowness and a spirit of "knownothingism," these wrongs can be remedied, and they can and should be formulated. One officer of the general government should have undivided authority and be held responsible for the enforcement of the law.

I view the immigration problem not from a mere selfish standpoint of our own protection, but I am persuaded that it not only tends to destroy the independence, progress and advancement of our people, but also is an efficient means by which the effete institutions of some of the European countries are perpetuated, and thus economical, political and social reforms postponed or avoided.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Birmingham, Ala., December, 1891.*

Contract laborers who are debarred by the decision of the immigrant authorities from landing, are required to be immediately deported to the countries from whence they came. Inasmuch as, however, they are, in most instances, the main witnesses against contractors in cases of suits brought in our courts for the recovery of the legal penalties, the deportation of such immigrants often makes it difficult to succeed in such prosecutions of contractors.

In order to avoid the keeping of immigrants as witnesses for an indefinite time awaiting the trial in the ordinary course, power should be given for proceeding before the courts on complaint of an Immigration Commissioner and for the bringing of summary proceedings, to be tried by court and jury, with the immigrants as witnesses. This would avoid dependence upon the local United States District Attorneys, who are by no means specialists on the immigration laws, and who have not shown a disposition to enforce existing law. It should also be provided that false testimony before the Boards of Special Inquiry, authorized to decide questions of the admissibility of immigrants, shall be perjury.

Immigrants who have been debarred a landing, as coming in violation of law as contract laborers, should be prohibited by statute from entry to any port of the United States for at least one year thereafter.

One of the most efficient steps which, in my judgment, should be taken to secure the exclusion of immigrants whom the spirit of the law forbids to land in this country would be the appointment of special agents under the Immigration Bureau who should be authorized to go to foreign ports and return per steerage, making covertly such inquiries and investigations as would lead to the detection of intending immigrants who come in violation of the law.

The fact that certain classes of "servants" have been permitted to land by reason of a technical defect in the law shows that the statute should be amended so as to exclude all kinds of foreign laborers who come here under contract.

The best efforts of the immigration officials to enforce the law are thwarted by many difficulties, among which is the coaching of immigrants by foreign ticket agents and officers of steamship lines, who instruct immigrants as to the manner in which they may evade official interrogations. The law should make such coaching a misdemeanor. The exclusion at the port of admission and the deportation of contract laborers would exercise the influence of preventing many others from emigrating.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Denver, Col., December, 1894.*

It is held by those who favor the unlimited immigration of Chinese laborers that the passage of an exclusion law would be detrimental to the commercial interests of the United States. Our answer is that the limited benefits of trade to be obtained by the so-called open-door policy in China can not in even the smallest degree recompense our people for the immensely greater loss caused by the displacement of so many of our countrymen who are consumers as well as producers.

The contrasted consuming power of the Chinese laborer is limited almost exclusively to the products of China, and the surplus of his earnings is sent out of this country, where it is earned, checking its prosperity, while the money paid as wages to our own people remains and correspondingly enriches it, stim-

ulating our own industry and trade, thereby tending to continue national prosperity. The very opposite effect is obtained by the employment of Chinese.

I shall certainly not at length attempt to discuss the economic phase of this proposition, but I heard some members ask whether the product of the Chinese does not enrich the country. Our answer is in the negative. We say that the Chinese laborers who work and produce, say, $2 worth as a selling price of an article and receive in return, say, $1 in the form of wages, and live, as the statistics show they do live, on 10 cents a day—if you please, say 15 cents per day—if men work and produce $2 worth and consume 15 cents worth of that production, that does not tend to enrich the country, for such a proportion of production and consumption can not continue for any appreciable length of time.

If, say, 100,000 men can continue to produce $2 worth and consume 15 cents' worth each day, the tendency must be that those who come in competition with them as laborers will find that certain articles have been produced at a given rate, and that they must conform, or nearly conform, to the standard of life of those who have produced the $2 worth.

Men do not produce simply for the sake of production. Production goes on because it is for use and to consume. If the people of the United States were to attempt to introduce the economic fallacy of having the workers produce, say, $2 worth and reduce their power of consumption, their power of production would decrease in even a greater ratio.—*From testimony before the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, February, 1902.*

I interested myself in securing the embodiment in the pending bill of a moderate educational test—a mere provision that adult immigrants must be able, before landing, to read, in some language, the Constitution of the United States. Exception is made of wives, of children under 18, and of parents over 50. All these, though unable to read, may be brought in, under the proposed law, by the heads of their families.

This regulation will exclude hardly any of the natives of Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, France, or Scandinavia. It will exclude only a small proportion of our immigrants from North Italy. It will shut out a considerable number of South Italians

and of Slavs and others equally or more undesirable and injurious.

A provision of this kind will be beneficial to the more desirable classes of immigrants, as well as to ourselves. It is good for them, no less than for us, to diminish the number of that class which by reason of its lack of intelligence, is slowest to appreciate the value of organization, and furnishes the easiest victims of the padrones and the unscrupulous employer. It is good for them, as well as for us, to raise the average intelligence of the citizens of the Republic. It is good to spur them to attain for themselves that measure of intelligence which we regard as indispensable to an American citizen. Every man who is worthy of American citizenship can, if he will, obtain the small measure of education which it is proposed to require; and it is better for him, as well as the country which he seeks to enter, that he should be compelled to get it. And even the countries from which the immigrants come may be spurred, by the standard which we set up, to provide better facilities for the education of their people, to the profit of those who remain at home, as well as of those who come to us.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, New Orleans, November, 1902.*

I do not believe that we can be justly accused of a failure to recognize the obligation of the fraternity of man because we desire restriction of immigration. But the principle that self-protection is the first law of nature applies to international questions the same as it does to the nation, to the family, to the individual. Let me add this, too, that if the American people adopt some practical measure that will stop to a considerable degree this wholesale immigration of people from several of the monarchical countries, where tyranny is the handmaid of poverty and misery, these people, being obliged to remain at home, will find the remedy for their economic and social ills in their own country, and thus compel reform and improvement.

One of the great devices for the safety of tyrants has always been either a foreign war, or to drive some of the people out of their country. If those dissatisfied spirits remain in their own homes, they will compel kings and czars and kaisers to reform their ways and bring about better conditions in their own countries. . . .

I do not want you to interpret my remarks as emanating from

an advocate of free trade, but it does seem an inconsistency to impose a tax, a duty upon the product of the European and Asiatic workmen if this product is brought to the ports of our country, and then to open up the same ports so that the workmen themselves can come here by the millions. . . .

I have not anything against the Chinaman. I have met some Chinamen of whom I think very much. But there is a whole heap of difference between the individual Chinaman we meet here and there, who has character and ambition and ideals, and whose aspirations are somewhat in unison with the ideals and the aspirations of the American citizen, and the average Chinaman who has come to the United States. I do not want to exclude the Chinaman from the United States because he is a Chinaman. I am opposed to the Chinaman coming to the United States because his ideals, his civilization, are absolutely in antagonism to the ideals and civilization of America. Never in the history of the world have Chinese gone to any country in any considerable numbers without one of two things occurring—first, that the Chinaman has dominated, or he has been driven out by force. The Chinaman is a cheap man.—*From address before Conference on Immigration, of The National Civic Federation, New York City, December, 1905.*

In his last annual message to Congress, the President recommended that our laws and treaties should be framed so as to put Chinese students, business and professional men of all kinds; not only merchants, but bankers, doctors, manufacturers, professors, preachers and the like, in the excepted class, but to state that we will *admit* all Chinese, except Chinese coolies, whether skilled or unskilled.

A few days thereafter a great conference was held in New York City which, from the lack of either information or understanding upon the subject, came near the point of endorsing that position. The conference finally adopted by almost unanimous vote the declaration for the enforcement of the existing satisfactory law and treaty upon the subject. It is with considerable pride that I can state that it was due to a few representatives of Labor, myself included, that the first declaration was repudiated and the latter endorsed.

A bill to change the law in accordance with the President's

recommendation was introduced in the House and very seriously pressed.

Last December, with a number of friends, I had an interview with the President, when his attention was called to the fact that if his recommendation were enacted into law the entire policy of our government and people would be changed.

The existing Chinese Exclusion Law provides in general terms that all Chinese shall be excluded from the United States and its possessions. Then the law proceeds to specify those who are exempt from the operations of the law, those who may come to our shores.

The recommendation of the President would, if enacted into law, in general terms specify that *all Chinese shall be admitted* to the United States and its possessions, and it then specifies those who would be exempt and *those who may not come.* That is, the Chinese coolies.

Your attention is called to the fact that the burden of proof now devolves upon the Chinese of the exempt classes to legally show their right to come to the United States, its territories, or its possessions.

If, on the other hand, the policy were reversed by the enactment of the President's recommendation, it would devolve upon the United States to legally and conclusively show that all Chinese coolies and laborers, no matter how great the numbers, and no matter how deep their deception, who would swarm to our country or its possessions, would not be legally entitled to enter.

I have no right to say that the President has changed his opinion upon the subject as the result of the conference referred to when it was brought to his attention how difficult and almost impossible it would be to exclude Chinese coolie laborers, whether skilled or unskilled, if the burden of proof were placed upon our government, but that he was interested in the new view and the new light in which the subject was placed before him, is beyond question.

That there have been a large number of Chinese coolies and laborers who have entered both the United States and its possessions since the issuance of the executive order last year, is manifest. In addition, it may be interesting to know that the Commissioner-General of Immigration testified before a congressional

committee that he was directed to enforce the Chinese Exclusion Law with less rigor.

It is now currently reported that there is being negotiated a treaty between the United States and China with a view of modifying and repealing existing law. Of course, it is not the intent or purpose of our Chinese Exclusion Law to bar the coming of bona fide students, business or professional men, or those who desire to travel for pleasure or information. Experience has, however, demonstrated the necessity for such safeguards from imposition, that the essential feature for the exempt classes who may come to our shores, is that they shall clearly show that they do not belong to the excluded class, the coolies and laborers.

The American people do not object to the Chinese because they are Chinese; they know from their own experience, as well as from the experience of ages of the peoples of other countries, that the Chinese coolies and laborers can not assimilate with our race; that their civilization, and ours as well, can not co-exist; that the physical conditions, the standard of life, the progress of our people, will not only be endangered but undermined and destroyed.

We join with all our people in the desire to ensure fair treatment to those who may lawfully come to our shores from China, but the deceptive character and means resorted to by Chinese coolies and laborers so as to enable them to come to the United States and its possessions in violation of law, leave us no alternative but to emphatically enter our protest, and by all honorable means at our command, whether by law or by treaty, to prevent the reversal of our policy which now in a measure safeguards us from the possibility of being overwhelmed by the coming of the hordes of Chinese.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Minneapolis, Minn., November, 1906.*

Your attention is called to the fact that in the new law, as in the old for more than thirty years, the provision is continued generally known as the anti-alien contract labor feature of the immigration law. Some months ago a body of workmen was engaged in a strike entirely provoked by the employers. The employers set out to obtain workmen by contract in foreign countries to come here and perform that work.

Protest was made against their admission, and the Board of

Special Inquiry at Ellis Island sustained the protest and ordered the deportation of the contract workmen. From that order the employers through their counsel appealed to the Department of Commerce and Labor, which in turn submitted the question to the Department of Justice. The Attorney-General, the chief of that Department, rendered an opinion which practically declared that "workmen of like kind" could not be obtained in the United States, and this, too, notwithstanding there were over one hundred unemployed who were capable and willing to perform the required work, but who declined to resign their membership in an organization as a condition precedent to such employment. Bound by the opinion of the Attorney-General, the Department of Commerce and Labor decided in accordance therewith, reversed the order of the Board of Special Inquiry for the deportation of these contract workmen, and they were admitted.

A similar case occurred, in another industry, quite recently and the same theory of the law was enforced; that is, workmen were engaged in a strike, the employers contracted with workmen in a foreign country, and these workmen were permitted to enter upon the theory that they were not "workmen of like kind" unemployed in the United States.

We contend that the alien-contract labor feature of the immigration law was designed and enacted for the purpose of preventing American workmen from being defeated in an effort to improve their conditions, and particularly to prevent deterioration and that, therefore, regardless of whether the relations of workmen with their employers are of the most amicable character, or whether they anticipate or are engaged in a trade dispute involving either a strike or a lockout, employers are prohibited by the law from bringing workmen to the United States under contract or promise of employment, whether written or implied. . . . That workmen have been locked out by their employers or are on strike does not enter into the situation, regardless of the questions in contention between such workmen and such employers; the fact that they are workmen capable of performing the service required and are unemployed is in itself the condition prohibiting employers from entering into a written or implied contract for "workmen of like kind" coming from any foreign country to our own.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Norfolk, Va., November, 1907.*

The advocacy of exclusion, is not prompted by any assumption of superior virtue over our foreign brothers. We disavow for American organized labor the holding of any vulgar or unworthy prejudices against the foreigner. We recognize the noble possibilities in the poorest of the children of the earth who come to us from European lands. We know that their civilization is sufficiently near our own to bring their descendants in one generation up to the general level of the best American citizenship. It is not on account of their assumed inferiority, or through any pusillanimous contempt for their abject poverty, that, most reluctantly, the lines have been drawn by America's workingmen against the indiscriminate admission of aliens to this country. It is simply a case of the self-preservation of the American working classes. Changes are constantly going on in Europe for the uplift of the men of labor, and it can well be believed that each country in Europe is in position to-day to solve its own labor questions in the way best for itself.—*American Federationist, January, 1911.*

America has not yet become a nation. It is still a conglomerate mass of various and diverse ethnic groups. Hordes of immigrants have crowded into our ports, and have, for the most part, settled in the nearest industrial center. In some cases they have in masses moved further inland to industrial centers where the nature of the work required comparatively little skill. In many of these cases the coming of the immigrants was due to the activities of managers of industries, who arranged to secure the financial advantages by employing foreign workers who still retained the standards and prejudices of other countries. So we find in many industrial centers sections that are known as "Little Hungary," "Little Italy," etc. The inhabitants of these little nations transplant to American soil the institutions and the standards of their fatherlands. They gain nothing by coming. These communities speak a foreign language, read foreign papers, dress in accord with foreign customs and bring up their families in accord with foreign standards. There is practically no sustained effort on the part of society or the nation to assimilate these foreign groups and to make of them Americans. Nor is this condition confined only to the poorer immigrants. There are foreign communities in the resident districts of the large cities.

These remain even more exclusively foreign because their wealth enables them to have foreign schools and foreign instruction for their children. Thus the foreign group and alien influence become rooted in the life of the community.

The workers of America have felt most keenly the pernicious results of the establishment of foreign standards of work, wages and conduct in American industries and commerce. Foreign standards of wages do not permit American standards of life. Foreign labor has driven American workers out of many trades, callings, and communities, and the influence of these lower standards has permeated widely.

For years the organized labor movement has called attention to these vicious tendencies which affect not only the workers but the whole nation, for national unity is weakened when the nation is honeycombed with "foreign groups" living a foreign life. . . .

It has been urged against the literacy test that this standard would make many suffer because they had been denied opportunities. That may be true, but it is equally true that our nation can not work out all of the problems of all other nations. We can not undertake to educate all of those to whom other countries deny educational opportunities. Each nation must undertake and solve its own educational problems. The adoption of the literacy test by our own country would have a tendency to force nations to establish more general educational opportunities for all of their people. It is only a half truth to say that the literacy test would close the gates of opportunity to illiterate foreigners. As a matter of fact there is very little real opportunity for these people in our industrial centers. Usually they have been brought over here either by steamship and railroad companies and other greedy corporations, by employers, or as a result of collusion between these groups. They have been brought over here for the purpose of exploitation, and until they develop powers of resistance and determination to secure things for themselves they have little opportunity here. These same qualities would secure for them within their own countries many of the advantages that later come to them here.—*American Federationist, April, 1916.*

THE TRUSTS AND LABOR

Our newspapers have labored under the imagination they can make the people believe that they are serious in the effort to attack and crush or wreck the trusts. They do not understand that the trust is simply an evolution from the old-time individual establishments merged into partnerships, into companies and again into corporations, and finally into the company of corporations, the trusts.

Experience will demonstrate that there is a power growing wholly unnoticed by our superficial friends of the press which will prove itself far more potent to deal with the trusts, or if the trusts inherently possess any virtue at all, to see that they are directed into a channel for the public good, and that growing power is the much despised organized labor movement of our country and our time. Wait and see.—*American Federationist, December, 1896.*

Organized labor is deeply concerned regarding the "swift and intense concentration of the industries," and it realizes that unless successfully confronted by an equal or superior power, there is economic danger and political subjugation in store for all.

But organized labor looks with apprehension at the many panaceas and remedies offered by theorists to curb the growth and development, or to destroy the combinations of industry. We have seen those who knew little of statecraft, and less of economics, urge the adoption of laws to "regulate" interstate commerce, and laws to "prevent" combinations and trusts; and we have also seen that these measures, when enacted, have been the very instruments to deprive labor of the benefit of organized effort, while at the same time they have simply proved incentives to more subtly and surely lubricate the wheels of capital's combination.

For our own part, we are convinced that the state is not capable of preventing the development, or the natural concentration of industry. All the propositions to do so which have come under our observation, would, beyond doubt, react with greater force and injury upon the working people of our country than upon the trusts.

The great wrongs attributable to the trusts are their corrupting

influence on the politics of the country, but as the state has always been the representative of the wealth possessors, we shall be compelled to endure this evil until the toilers are organized and educated to the degree that they shall know that the state is by right theirs, and finally and justly come to their own, while never relaxing in their efforts to secure the very best possible economic, social and material improvement in their condition. . . .

In the early days of our modern capitalist system, when industry was conducted under the individual employer, the individual workmen deemed themselves able to cope for their rights; when industry developed and employers formed companies, the workingman formed unions; when industry concentrated into great combinations, the workingmen formed their national and international unions; as employments became trustified, the toilers organized federations of all unions, local, national and international, such as the American Federation of Labor.

We shall continue to organize and federate the grand army of labor, and with our mottoes, fewer hours of labor, higher wages, and an elevated standard of life, we shall establish equal and exact justice for all.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Detroit, Mich., December, 1899.*

We can not, if we would, turn back to the primitive conditions of industry which marked the early part of the last century. It is therefore idle chatter to talk of annihilating trusts.

In the association of many persons in order to secure the large sums of money necessary to finance modern industry, lay the germ of the trust. We not only can not prevent the association of these vast organizations of capital in what we call trusts, but in some sense we should not wish to do so.

The trust is, economically speaking, the *logical and inevitable accompaniment and development* of our modern commercial and industrial system.

It lessens the waste in production which is bound to occur under individual initiative. In fact, the trust may be said to have successfully solved the problem of the greatest economy in production. It has, however, other important functions which as a rule it does not yet properly perform and the failure in these

respects very justly arouses a widespread and intense feeling of protest among the masses of our people.

Asserting that the trust is a logical and inevitable feature of our modern system of industry is merely stating that our modern plan of production, which for brevity and convenience we call the trust system, is the most perfect yet attained. We do not, however, mean to imply by this that the *individuals* who form trusts, who manipulate them, who profit by them, are logically and inevitably right in many of the methods they employ or the lengths to which they go. Neither do we concede the argument that these individuals who form and manage trusts are so superior a class of beings that they are entitled to the enormous largesse which many of them claim from the profits of economical production. Quite the contrary is the fact. Much of the protest against trust methods is justly and legitimately based on the fact that trust promoters, managers, and owners seize and keep for themselves a far greater share of the profits of modern production and distribution than that to which they are entitled. . . .

Many of these gentlemen are merely fortunate accidents in the crystallization of a new era. They too, often, forget that they are bound to give accounting, to do justice to that great force which makes industry possible—the people—in their two capacities, as *producers* and *consumers*. . . .

It is only fair to say that the greatest and most enlightened combinations of capital in industry have not seriously questioned the right and, indeed, the advisability of organization among employees. There is economy of time and power and means of placing responsibility in "collective bargaining" with employees which bring the best results for the benefit of all.

Organized labor has less difficulty in dealing with large firms and corporations to-day than with many individual employers or small firms.

We have recently seen examples of the bitter antagonism to labor by certain small employers, whose ideas of industry seem to be medieval rather than modern. To some extent they have grasped the idea of organization or association among themselves, but they fail to concede the necessity of organization among wage-workers. In an opera bouffe fashion they emulate the robber barons of the middle ages, whose sole idea of profit was to plunder the individual whom they could find at a disadvantage,

The workers of the country have pretty thoroughly mastered the broad economic truth that organization is the watchword of modern industry. Labor concedes the right of organization among employers. It is perfectly willing to deal with such associations, provided its own rights are not denied or invaded. To put it more strongly, provided its rights are recognized and conceded. . . .

The perception of what a trust really is becomes the more confused, because the great aggregations of capital, loosely called by that name, differ much in their characteristics. Some strive to monopolize certain valuable and necessary sources of natural wealth, in order to completely control production, and, in addition, undertake to monopolize every avenue of distribution so completely that the consumer may be delivered to them, bound hand and foot, helpless against their most exorbitant demands, and all this for the enrichment of the few individuals who have contrived, in the shifting elements of a new era, to gain such control.

Yet this abuse of methods and functions does not at all invalidate the fact that this is absolutely the era of association as contrasted with individual effort, nor does the foregoing characterization apply to all trusts.

Serious problems, indeed, confront us, but they are not hopeless. *In intelligent and associated use of the powers of the many* will be found the solution. Disorganized and violent denunciation is more harmful than helpful. Constructive and associated effort must check and correct the abuses which have grown so rapidly in this era of concentrated methods of production and distribution.

The wage-workers of the country are setting an example in this respect. Their efforts will be successful in proportion to the unity of their effort and the thoroughness with which the people at large realize that the masses are one in interest and have unlimited power to check aggression, if they but assert their rights and their powers and use them constructively, intelligently, and with unswerving persistence. . . .

For the consumer to shout "down with the trusts" because he finds his pocket-book affected is no more reasonable than the cry of "smash the machines" which was once heard from wage-workers whose means of livelihood were threatened during the

period of adjustment in certain trades while machinery was replacing hand labor.

It is easy to comment on the short-sightedness of the poor misguided worker who had no organization and no philosophy to tide him over the period of adjustment and who had not yet learned to fit himself to the new conditions, but it does not seem so easy for many people to see that trust smashing is quite as impossible a remedy for the evils which now confront them.

It must be trust reform in order that our vaunted economy in production and distribution shall inure to all the people to whatever degree they are entitled. That reform, to be effective, must come from another source than that now generally accepted. There must be created a public opinion which will see to it that the will of the *people* and not the mandate of corporate influences shall be paramount. What we want is a more democratic spirit in the conduct of our affairs, industrial, commercial, executive, legislative, and judicial.—*From address at Chicago Conference on Trusts, October, 1907.*

CONTROL OF CAPITAL AND FINANCE

Already it is discerned that finance has been largely dethroned from its all-controlling power over labor and industry. Up to a decade ago, if exposures had been made as have been made in the recent past, of peculation as well as speculation and of the corrupting influences of "high finance," a financial panic, involving an industrial crisis and stagnation, with all its attendant evils, would undoubtedly have been inevitable.

The time is happily passing when purely speculative finance can hold the dominating power to endow or undo industry. With more compact organization of labor, with more enlightened employers, finance is taking and will take its proper place and perform its proper functions, that of serving the purpose of real industry and trade, of being a real measure of value, a medium of exchange. Thus the relative position of importance is being transposed, and industry and commerce are coming to control and regulate finance.

It is labor and industry which create values, money included. In finance, as in all things, the created thing should never be greater than its creator. The Frankenstein, the power of finance

which the people in the past created, has been given its proper limitations and power, and with intelligence it will no longer threaten death or destruction to those who gave it the breath of life.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Pittsburgh, Pa., November, 1905.*

The full value of production does not go to the actual workingmen to-day. A portion goes to investment, superintendence, agencies for the creation of wants among people, and many other things. Some of these are legitimate factors in industry entitled to reward, but many of them should be eliminated. The legitimate factors are superintendency, the creation of wants, administration, returns for investment in so far as it is honest investment and does not include watered stock or inflated holdings.

Whether or not dividends should be paid as an incident to stock ownership regardless of the personal services performed, the activity or inactivity of the owner of the stock, depends altogether upon whether the investment is an honest one. An honest investment is an honest actual physical investment. . . . Very much of the opposition to the efforts of the working people to secure improved conditions has come from those who obtain what may be called an unearned share in the distribution.—*From abstract of testimony before United States Commission on Industrial Relations, New York City, May 21-23, 1914.*

The eternal problem with which the labor movement has to cope is control of property—to bring property into such relations to human life that it shall serve and not injure. The struggle has been long and hard but the day is past when the labor movement has to justify its right to be classified as a necessary agency with a function to perform in achieving greater freedom and justice. Its claim to acceptance as an instrumentality for achieving human progress is based upon the nature and the value of the service it renders. It was born out of efforts of workers to think out modern phases of that world-old universal problem —property.

Trade unions regard property and the laws of property as human institutions, intended for service in the development of individuality, giving each a feeling of security and assurance and independence, which mean freedom to direct and control his life. . . .

It [the trade union movement] does not seek to overthrow private property. It regards private property as a necessary agency for securing opportunity for individual independence and resourcefulness, but it wishes to safeguard private property for use by preventing the perversion of property as an agency purely for exploitation and individual aggrandizement in order to establish an autocracy.—*American Federationist, November, 1916.*

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

We are unable to join in the enthusiasm manifested by the governing powers of the State of Minnesota over their "successful" methods of putting the price of binder twine down to three cents below the level at which "the trust" is able to sell it. Nor can we hurrah very heartily over the fact that by the same method the State will regulate the market rates of agricultural implements in the coming year.

The State's method is simple—so simple that the morality of it seems to have evaded the attention of its legislative, judicial, and executive departments, and of its citizens in general. It is the good old plan of reducing a workingman to slavery and taking from him by force all of the product of his labor except a bare subsistence. Success in this plan blinded many a generation of slaveholders, and the success of Minnesota is undoubted, for she made a profit of $189.69 last year out of every slave in her twine works, and with her new agricultural implement works also operated by the same sort of slave labor her total profits from this source are expected in future to average $300,000 a year. All goes into the State treasury.

Apart from our objections to slave labor, the feature of the plan which results in barring the trust-made binder twine out of Minnesota brings up in our bosom certain disturbing sensations. There are many good trade union people working for "trusts" in this country, if by the word "trust" is to be meant any industry conducted on a large scale. The railroads are an example. Actually, we prefer to see railroad men in their present condition than in slavery.

The binder twine trust employed free labor to make the goods it formerly sold in Minnesota. Each slave who is now handing over to the State $189.69 annually has been substituted for a

freeman, whose wages must have been approximately the same as those prevailing in similar grades of work in the United States, and on the whole, after some extended observation, we believe that the general American rate of wages is still somewhat more than sufficient to maintain our workingmen above the slave level. We shall be reckless right here and now and say, however much the trust in the financial and industrial field is abhorrent to justice, we are willing to tolerate it for a little while longer rather than see it abolished by the Minnesota method. There may possibly be some other way.—*American Federationist, November, 1910.*

From every point of view this step of the French Government [dissolving the syndicate of school teachers] assists the observer of State socialism in a study of its principles and operation. The Government as employer brooks no opposition from its employees. It can, and does, wipe out their organization. It can, and does, through its heads of administration, proceed further than the law-making branch has by statute authorized. It can, and does, control the political activities of the employees. It can, and does, hire and discharge not only by merit, but by systems of exclusion bearing upon the political principles of applicants for, or holders of, positions. With every extension of the functions of government, as they are now exercised in France, the field of freedom of the individual is obviously narrowed. The trade union is the one defense and protector of the wage-workers in any occupation whatsoever—no body of employers can decree the dissolution of a union. The heads of government departments can. To carry out such a decree is, of course, another thing. But should the workers of America take the risk of inviting such a decree by conferring greater powers of this character upon the government? Is there no lesson for America's workers in this action of the government of the Republic of France?—*American Federationist, February, 1913.*

Several resolutions [at Seattle Convention, A. F. of L., 1913] dealt with the subject of government ownership. Its great importance to workers arises from the effect municipal ownership would have upon labor organizations, and hence upon labor conditions. The convention endorsed the resolution of the street-

car employees, denouncing the denial of the right to organize under municipal ownership, directing the Executive Council to prepare a bill for the purpose of preventing that practice, and instructing state branches to assist in its enactment into state law. Endorsement of collective ownership of mines, railroads, and industries supplying necessities, was refused. In view of the importance of the matter and the tendency favoring municipal ownership the convention deemed it wise and necessary to direct the Executive Council to make a thorough investigation as to wages, hours, conditions of employment, and rights of employees in places where municipal ownership has been adopted.—*American Federationist, January, 1914.*

Governmental ownership and control like other institutions grow by what they feed on. Governmental ownership and control instituted for one phase of industrial relations gradually but inevitably reach out to other connected relations until the whole is under the domination not of the people but of an oligarchy—a bureaucracy.

A good illustration of immediate conditions resulting from putting all forces and institutions at the service of society exists to-day in Germany. There is no consideration given the individual, the welfare of the majority is the declared purpose of every policy. All of the activities, the relations and the customs of the nation are specifically regulated in the interest of the nation. What is a war measure there constitutes the negation of personal freedom. Each individual is assigned to that work by which he can contribute the greatest service to the majority of the people. Everything is controlled—the use of the land for agriculture and the number of slices of bread. The regulation is efficient.

England has established the principle of ownership and control but has not applied it so generally. The latest papers from Australia indicate that this governmental control and ownership have a much firmer grip upon industrial conditions because the methods and agencies for control were already in existence and the principle was an established practice, and therefore did not meet with serious objection.

There is for every state of Australia and for the Commonwealth machinery for controlling hours of work, wages and con-

ditions of work. As a result of the industrial upheavals resulting from the war officials in charge of the wages-regulating machinery immediately gave the hint that the upward movement of that machinery was blocked, but that movement in the other direction was possible. Employers at once took the "tip" and have made a vigorous effort to reduce wages under existing awards.

In several states Necessary Commodities Commissions were appointed with power to fix prices. These worked independently of the officials fixing wages—a bad arrangement for those who are expected to adapt decreasing wages to increasing prices.

It is charged that the price fixed for wheat by the governmental agents has been manipulated in Victoria and in New South Wales to enable the wheat buyers to secure exorbitant profits at the expense of the farmers. The millers of Victoria charge the speculators with gambling a "corner on wheat."

The remedy proposed is additional control—to make sales compulsory upon demand at a fixed price. It is recognized that desire for individual gain is an important element in these efforts to make money, and it is further proposed to regulate out of existence all undesirable selfish elements in human nature. Would that it were possible—but experience demonstrates that the machine for "regulation" becomes the chief object of manipulation.

Other illustrations of governmental control are the fixing of the price of butter by the New South Wales government; the whole of the Australian woolen mills are now organized as part of the Defense Department; the New South Wales government has definitely decided, according to the Attorney-General, to extend the state bakery system to cover New South Wales. The intention is to nationalize the bread industry. The Australian bakeries were on the eve of installing machinery which in addition to the concentration of monopoly management would throw many out of employment. But under the new governmental policy the private employers will be spared the expense of purchasing the machinery as well as the cost of the rearrangement or transition from hand to machine labor.

But the bakery workers do not view their future with pleasure. The Sydney Bakers' Union adopted a motion condemning any action taken by the government which will minimize employment. It is now suggested that the government undertake governmental operation of more industries in order to give these

men work. It is pointed out that governmental operation of bakeries can be made more effective by extending state control to flour mills. Thus one step in governmental regulation leads to another and another.

Recently the medical profession was startled by a proposal to nationalize the hospitals of New South Wales.

As a matter of fact, conditions in Australia lead to the conviction that governmental ownership and control solve nothing. They simply transfer industrial problems to the political field, restate them in political terms and then try to solve them by political methods. They do not touch the causes of industrial unrest as directly and as effectively as the use of economic agencies and methods. The industrial injustice resultant from the evils in modern industry as well as the result of the inherent weakness and characteristics of human nature has not been bettered but made infinitely worse by government ownership and control. Those fundamental causal elements can be best held in check by the stronger economic force, at least until social and individual morality reach a higher plane.

What then is the advantage of governmental ownership and control over conditions in the United States? Are experiences of wrongs, injury and injustice, even if inflicted upon other people, to have no lesson for us?—*American Federationist, June, 1915.*

The defeat by the labor unions of the proposed municipal street-car system in Detroit has puzzled and taken aback the "intellectual" group of advocates of public ownership of utilities in general. They have been in the habit of hastily going ahead with their theories without taking into account the lessons the wage-workers have learned thereon, sometimes *at a dear price.* . . . Trade unionists are convinced that to take away by arbitrary order both the laborer's supreme lawful right to dispose of his labor at his own will and the laborer's correlative rights to hearing, petition, and association is to crush him and abandon him in helpless slavery. No municipal ownership scheme, with trade unionism left out, can be acceptable to trade unionists and liberty-loving citizens.—*American Federationist, February, 1916.*

The employees of the government are denied the right collectively to lay down their tools or implements of their work and

quit. They cannot strike. They are forbidden to strike. A few letter carriers in West Virginia a few months ago undertook collectively to send in their resignations. They have been indicted and in order that they might have the smallest, lowest sentences imposed upon them, some of them consented, under protest, and did plead guilty and thus the precedent has been established. How it was brought about, how it was manipulated, I am not in a position to say, but that it was a great wrong and cannot bear the scrutiny of investigation I am satisfied. But that is the status of the government employee in so far as the right to strike is concerned.—*From address at Mass Meeting, Washington, D. C., December 18, 1916, in behalf of salary increases for Government clerks.*

Now that several suggestions looking toward government ownership are under discussion, it would be well for the employees of those enterprises to consider carefully the plight in which present government employees find themselves. Pay standards in the government service have not been revised for fifty years. Costs of living have been rising—precipitously rising within the past twelve months. Government employees, previously none too generously paid, have felt the keen pinch of discomfort as they tried to adjust to meet present conditions.

This year they presented to Congress definite demands for salary increases. Congress having made generous appropriations for all manner of enterprises and suggested $18,000,000 for rivers and harbors, suddenly finds itself confronted by a deficit and tells a hard luck story to its petitioning employees.

Now what are these employees to do? Meekly submit and submit to the injustice Congress refuses to remedy? They can not, like employees in private industries, assert their rights. It is claimed that government employees have foregone the right to strike. The government has restricted their political rights—political activity is not tolerated in the service. Many employees are women and therefore have not even the right to cast a ballot. Many of the men workers have been unable to maintain a residence where they have the right to vote.

The right of economic organization does not meet with favor from several departmental chiefs who covertly seek to destroy the union by victimizing union men. . . .

It is well for all the workers to seriously consider the plunge into government ownership; whether after all it would not involve the plight of jumping from the frying pan into the fire. —*American Federationist, February, 1917.*

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

We contend that education in America must be free, democratic, conducted by, of, and for the people, and that it must never be consigned to, or permitted to remain in, the power of private interests where there is sure to be the danger of exploitation for private profit and willful rapacity. Under the pretense of industrial education private agencies for personal profit have perverted the term, resulting in a narrow and specialized training to the detriment of the pupils, the workers, and people generally.

Modern methods of manufacturing with their division and subdivision and specialization have to a large extent, rendered nearly superfluous and therefore largely eliminated the all-round skilled worker. Some so-called modern apprenticeship systems are narrow, producing a line of trained "specialists." It has been well said that specialists in industry are vastly different from specialists in the professions. In the professions specialists develop from the knowledge of all the elements of the science of the profession. Specialists in industry are those who know but one part of a trade and absolutely nothing of any other part of it. In the professions specialists are possessed of all the learning in their professions; in industry the specialists are denied the opportunity of learning the commonest elementary rudiments of industry other than the same infinitesimal part performed by them perhaps thousands of times over each day.

Our movement in advocating industrial education protests most emphatically against the elimination from our public school system of any line of learning now taught. Education, technically or industrially, must be supplementary to and in connection with our modern school system. That for which our movement stands will tend to make better workers of our future citizens, better citizens of our future workers.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Toronto, Canada, December, 1909.*

Conservation is one of the topics uppermost in the mind of the American public to-day, but there is one phase of conservation which is not receiving the attention which it deserves; I refer to the *conservation of the brain and brawn of our American youth.* Our school systems are giving only a one-sided education; the boy may go to school and prepare himself for professional or commercial life, or he may drop out of school and enter a trade with no particular preparation and become a mediocre workman. Training of brain and muscle must go together for the complete preparation of men.

While the public schools and colleges aim only at teaching professions, the greatest need of America, educationally, is the improvement of industrial intelligence and working efficiency in the American youth. We need an educational uplift for the work of the boy who will work with his hands, and we not only need to give an educational uplift to craftsmanship, but the school needs the help of the workman and his better work in education. We should realize better the interdependence between our common education and our common industries. This can be effectuated only by a system of industrial schools, differentiated from the manual training schools, which shall actually train workmen for the trades and at the same time give them a broader mental culture. . . .

The fact that industrial education, like academic education, is becoming a public function and that it should be paid for by public funds is fast gaining supporters. At a recent meeting in Indianapolis the department of superintendents of the National Education Association placed on record its approval of the general plan, and especially emphasized the desirability of enlarging the work of the Federal and State Departments and Bureaus which have to do with public education. But most significant is the following declaration by that organization:

"That the department, while heartily approving every agency that may be used to advance the educational interests of both States and Nation, places itself on record as disapproving any appropriation made by either legislatures or Congress for any institution which is not supported exclusively by public funds and which is not subject to complete Federal and State control and investigation."

—From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.

It is not generally known that to the organized labor movement of Massachusetts belongs the credit of establishing public schools in Massachusetts and the general public school system as it has since developed. Prior to that time there were schools which children of poor parents could attend, but attendance at such schools carried with it the stigma of the poverty of the parents. Such poverty was a stigma then. The labor movement of Massachusetts secured the enactment of a law removing as a requirement for attendance at these schools that the parents of the children must declare that they could not afford to pay for the tuition of their children. Thus came into existence the first public school in the United States.—*From abstract of testimony before United States Commission on Industrial Relations, New York City, May 21-23, 1914.*

The period is almost past where the United States can depend upon cheap raw materials obtained with comparatively little labor from its mines and virgin fields. It is entering upon a period when it must depend upon the qualities of human labor. Under these conditions industrial decline is the only alternative to industrial education. Do you think that organized labor is going to advocate a policy of industrial decline—a policy of competing on a basis of cheap labor, instead of trained and efficient labor? . . .

Do you think it is going to advocate the adoption of Chinese methods in its competition with Europe? I can assure you that the American workingman will not accept any such solution of the problem. He will insist that competition shall be upon the basis not of cheap brute labor, but of intelligent efficient skilled labor, which means that he will in the future, as he has done in the past, insist that the instruction in our public schools be made democratic. In a word, that the public schools generally shall institute industrial education, and that that education shall be based upon an exhaustive study of the industries to determine what sort of industrial training is required and is most conducive to the physical, mental, material and social welfare of the workers, the quality of citizenship, the perpetuity of our republic and fulfillment of its mission as the leader in the humanitarianism of the world. . . .

Organized labor has always opposed and will continue to op-

pose sham industrial education, whether at public or at private expense. It has opposed and will continue to oppose that superficial training which confers no substantial benefit upon the worker—does not make him a craftsman but only an interloper, who may be available in times of crisis, perhaps as a strike breaker, but not as a trained artisan for industrial service at other times. Industrial education must train men for work, not for private and sinister corporation purposes. . . .

Organized labor has opposed and will continue to oppose some enterprises which have been undertaken in the name of industrial education. It has opposed and will continue to oppose the exploitation of the laborer even when that exploitation is done under the name of industrial education. It may continue to regard with indifference, if not with suspicion some private schemes of industrial education. With regard to such enterprises where they are instituted by employers, with a single eye to the profit of such employers, organized labor will have to be shown that the given enterprise is not a means of exploiting labor—a means of depressing wages by creating an over supply of labor in certain narrow fields of employment.

Organized labor cannot favor any scheme of industrial education which is lop-sided—any scheme, that is to say, which will bring trained men into any given trade without regard to the demand for labor in that trade. Industrial education must maintain a fair and proper apportionment of the supply of labor power to the demand for labor power in every line of work. . . . Otherwise its advantages will be entirely neutralized. If, for example, the result of industrial education is to produce in any community a greater number of trained machinists than are needed, those machinists who have been trained cannot derive any benefit from their training since they will not be able to find employment except at economic disadvantage. Under these conditions industrial education is of no advantage to those who have received it, and it is a distinct injury to the journeymen working at the trade who are subjected to a keen competition artificially produced. Industrial education must meet the needs of the worker as well as the requirements of the employer. . . .

Industrial education should be in every instance based upon a survey of the industries of the community—upon an accumulation of facts regarding the employments in the community.

Upon such a basis the public schools may properly proceed to provide for the particular industrial needs of the community and with such an accumulation of data in hand there can be no excuse if industrial education does not prove to be of undoubted benefit to labor and to the community.—*From address before National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, Richmond, Va., December 10, 1914.*

The organized labor movement realizes that education is not an arbitrary thing that automatically ends with a certain year of life, but that it must continue throughout life if the individual is really to live and make progress. Appreciation of this fact has resulted in the demand on the part of organized labor for wider use of the schools in order that fuller and better opportunities for learning, culture and sociability may be brought into the common life. They realize that education is an attitude toward life—an ability to see and understand problems and to utilize information and forces for the best solution of these problems. New information and wider knowledge make possible the maintenance of this attitude as long as life shall last. . . .

The noblest mission of the schools is to teach the worth of a man or a woman, to teach the value of the individual and his life. This teaching must be supplemented with practical knowledge that enables each to realize his fullest possibilities. Education must be founded upon truths that break down insidious and unjustified distinctions between the kinds of work by which individuals express themselves. . . .

An education that glorifies the creative ability of the individual —his labor—is injecting a revolutionary idea into all our philosophy of life. Such a plan of education will bring into the spirit of our nation a force that will make for larger freedom, for greater progress and effectiveness. It will be in direct opposition to that education which promotes docility, submissiveness, conformity. It will make possible for each to stamp his life work with all of the artistic imagery of which his nature is capable. —*From address before the National Educational Association, New York City, July 7, 1916.*

A serious national deficiency has been made conspicuous by the draft. There are 700,000 men who can neither read nor

write who are liable to military service. These men though liable to military service can not sign their own names, can not read orders daily posted on bulletin boards in the camps, can not read their Manual of Arms, can not read or write home letters, can not understand the signals or follow the Signal Corps in time of battle.

These men in doing military service will be under serious handicap that may be dangerous to fellow-soldiers and the military undertaking.

As a consequence of illiteracy, the man-power of the nation is only partly available when it is essential to have full power efficiency.

Illiteracy is the greatest enemy of progress of an individual or nation. It results in ignorance and inability to appreciate or utilize opportunities; inability to make decisions—conditions that are incompatible with democracy.

War needs focus attention upon the draft illiterates, but in addition to these there is a national civil problem amazing to the majority of our citizens. . . .

The whole problem of progress is fundamentally educational in character. The problems of to-day and the future will tax the ability of our citizens even though equipped with the best education which our schools can afford. Within our Republic every individual should possess the rudiments of education with which he can train himself to a higher education, if denied other opportunities and assistance. To withhold opportunity for education for the least among our people is a crime committed against our Republic.—*American Federationist, May, 1918.*

The industrial education which is being fostered and developed should have for its purpose not so much training for efficiency in industry as training for life in an industrial society. A full understanding must be had of those principles and activities that are the foundation of all productive efforts. Children should not only become familiar with tools and materials, but they should also receive a thorough knowledge of the principles of human control, of force and matter underlying our industrial relations and sciences. The danger that certain commercial and industrial interests may dominate the character of education must be averted by insisting that the workers shall have equal representa-

tion on all boards of education or committees having control over vocational studies and training.

To elevate and advance the interests of the teaching profession and to promote popular and democratic education, the right of the teachers to organize and to affiliate with the movement of the organized workers must be recognized.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlantic City, N. J., June, 1919.*

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The petition to Congress in favor of submitting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the several States for ratification, granting the right of suffrage to women, was printed and circulated. It affords me pleasure to say that the petition was signed by more than two hundred and seventy thousand organized workmen, and placed in the hands of the committee having that subject specially in charge.

It is not vain to hope that the time is not far distant when women, who are amenable to the laws of our country and States, shall have the right of a voice in framing them equal to their brothers.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Birmingham, Ala., December, 1891.*

The increasingly widening functions of the government make legislative and administrative problems of increasing concern to women—working women and the wives and daughters of working men. The organization of markets, food prices, pure food laws, municipal sanitation, building regulations, school laws, child labor laws, and an almost endless list, bring politics very close into the common life. These things should and do concern women very vitally. For that reason women should participate in their consideration and determination directly.—*From press statement, September, 1914.*

Working women feel most keenly the necessity for the right of franchise. Women can not have equal power with men in the industrial struggle while they are classified with idiots and irresponsibles in political affairs. The ballot and political influence give power and opportunity. If opportunity and power are restricted those individuals are thereby hampered in all

activities. The ballot will bring power because it would bring full citizenship. . . .

They [women] know that the use of the ballot will not solve industrial problems. The right to use the ballot increases the power and the resourcefulness of voters whether they be men or women, and thereby puts them in such position that they are better able to work out their industrial problems. The right to vote does not mean that women will necessarily have work. Equal suffrage does not necessarily mean equal pay for equal work. These industrial problems women will work out only when through organization they have industrial power and influence that will enable them to secure higher wages, shorter hours and better working conditions. The relations between suffrage and industrial betterment must not be confused. It is a matter of justice that there should be equal pay for equal work. The ballot will help but will not necessarily bring this about. It will result only from the intelligent self-interested activity on the part of the women.

But women must have the ballot—they are going to have the ballot because they are human beings and members of organized society equal in intelligence, rights and desires with men.—*Press statement, August, 1915.*

FREE SPEECH AND PUBLIC ASSEMBLY

Within the past few years there has been a direct purpose and what appears to be a tacit understanding among the authorities of our several States and municipalities to violate one of the fundamental principles and rights guaranteed to the people. The right of free assemblage and free speech has been won at the sacrifice of thousands of lives and of fortunes untold. Yet the right of free speech and free assemblage is as much in question to-day as it was centuries ago.

We may have little if any sympathy with the expressions of those who are opposed to our system of government, or we may be their outspoken antagonists, but we should at all times maintain the constitutional rights of the people, of free speech and free assemblage. It requires but a stretch of authority to interfere and break up the meetings of our unions as was recently the case with the Painters' Union of Chicago, and still others re-

ported to us.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Birmingham, Ala., December, 1891.*

Grant for even a moment that the courts have a right by injunction to *enjoin from publishing,* and what will be the logical result? It will come to pass, as one already said, the press can not expose political corruption because it hurts some "boss." It can not criticize an hostile or indifferent administration because the Chief Executive would be annoyed. The *Congressional Record* may be censored because some Senator or Representative has the courage to uncover the lawlessness of powerful wrongdoers. Even the President's message may be interdicted. The press will not dare to expose the horrors of child labor and the exploitation of helpless women workers.

Forbid us to state any *one* unpleasant truth and the way is opened to go the whole limit of press censorship and prohibition. As we said in our statements to the judge, "the freedom of the press was given *not* that we might say the *pleasant things,* but that we might say the *things* which are *unpleasant* that we might criticize the wrong; that we might call attention to truths as yet unrecognized; that even if we might do a wrong we would better have the right and be subject to punishment than that the freedom to print and speak should be denied. The injunction *denies in advance* the right to speak or print. It puts an absolute censorship on press and speech.—*From editorial in American Federationist, February, 1909, on Justice Wright's Decision.*

Riotous, purposeless, uproarious agitation does more harm than good, it makes society more unified against the demands of the workers. Free speech and free assemblage are rights that are fundamental in securing redress of grievances—yet the exercise of these rights will be hedged about by more restrictions because of the vain excesses of the "Industrial Workers of the World." Those who oppress the working people have nothing to lose by outbreaks of violence and wild talk, because these things only prejudice the public, the workers included, against all proposals, good and bad alike. It leaves the workers helpless, with hope dispelled and confidence in themselves and each other destroyed.—*American Federationist, April, 1914.*

CONVICT LABOR AND PRISON REFORM

The chief argument of those who exploit the labor of convicts under the contract system and those who defend the exploiters —for profit to themselves—has been that the convict must be employed during incarceration. This cry, as old as the contract system of convict labor itself, is hypocritical and sophistical. The use of it by profit mongers is an endeavor to place labor in a false position and to cover their own heartlessness and perfidy.

Certainly no thoughtful, humane person, and most assuredly no trade unionist, wants the inmates of our prisons to remain idle. Every one is in agreement that they should be employed. No labor representative has privately suggested or publicly expressed a desire to keep these offenders against society in idleness.

Impositions upon the credulity of the people have always been inspired by the grasping prison-labor contractor and his hirelings. And the sole plea of those who fatten upon the misery and shortcomings of the unfortunates, and those who have successfully thrived upon the cupidity of State legislators, is an imposition.

The convict contract labor system is a curse to the convict, the State, the prison officials, the fair employer, the short-sighted merchant, and the honest toiler for wages.

The contract system of prison labor is inhuman, dishonest, and stupid. It is a disgrace to our highly trained scientific twentieth century and a blot upon our boasted civilization. It is deceptively presented to the representatives of a State as a device that will procure ample revenue to reimburse the State for the expense of caring for the convicts, allow the convicts to "earn something for themselves," and of late a more specious but not less transparent claim is made that the "poor convict" is being taught a trade so that when he is released he can procure honorable employment at good wages.

Not one of these statements can be successfully maintained. They fall of their own weight when analyzed. In the first place, the largest part of the profit of the labor of the prisoners under the contract system does not go to defray his expenses to the State. It does not go to the convict himself. It goes to the third party, the contractor who has no interest whatever, either in the welfare of the convict or the interest of the State, other

than to add to his swollen profits from the misfortunes of the criminal. Consequently, no reformation results. The prisoners are not deceived. They know they are robbed. They become hardened and learn to hate society for the crime society permits to be practiced upon them under the name of—law.

"The contract system furnishes revenue to the State," say the prison labor contractors and their apologists. Your attention is called to what Mr. Scates confessed at the last hearings before the House Committee on Labor. Said he:

"I speak by the book. I had seven years' experience in the Maryland Penitentiary on the shoe contract. Maryland is one of the few contract States which nets a profit from its prisoners. . . . I know the State made about $40,000 one year. . . . At that time the contractor divided with his partners. One got $5,000, another $10,000, another $15,000, and he took $65,000 as his own profit from the Maryland Penitentiary."

The State got $40,000 and the contractors $95,000. The contractors got over 70 per cent. of the total, nearly two and one-half times as much as the State obtained from the labor of its convicts.

Mr. Floyd, a member of the committee, testified that in his State (Arkansas) the contractors pay the State 50 cents per prisoner per day and then hire them out to the railroads and on the public works of the State for $1.75 per day. Could any scheme be more venal or more stupid?

The suggestion that men are taught trades in prison under the contract system is ridiculous. They learn how to make shirts and overalls, which is women's employment. They make hollow-ware, which is now a prison monopoly. They make chairs, and by so doing have driven fair employers and honest wage-workers in that industry out of business. "Your prisons," recently said an eminent English penologist, who, visiting the United States in connection with the International Prison Congress, had concluded a tour of investigation, "are not reformatories. They are factories."

This transparent fraud must be abolished. Convicts must be employed by the State direct on its own account and not on account of the contractor. The state may derive economic, but it must secure social advantage from the labor of the convict. The first consideration must be the welfare of, and the influence upon, the prisoners during incarceration and after their release;

the second, consideration of the free, honest citizen workman, and third, the interest of the State as a financial and political entity.

Prisoners should be employed at useful and practical productive toil. The labor of the States' unfortunates and derelicts should never be exploited for profit and certainly never for the private profit of contractors. Let our States employ their prisoners in the production of the necessaries of life, for the maintenance of themselves and the inmates of the other State eleemosynary institutions, or else road building.

The police power of a State undoubtedly extends without question to all laws regulating the health, the morals, and the general peace, comfort, and safety of the community, and is broadly construed to include all laws that promote the general welfare. In no essential can the general welfare of the State be better protected than for the Congress to assure each State of its right of home rule within the confines of the State, so that no State should become without its will the dumping ground for goods made by convicts of other States. The enactment of H. R. 12000, now before Congress, would give the legislatures of the States the right and power to protect their own citizens from the unfair competition of the contract convict labor of those States which care more for the profits of their prison labor contractors than for their prisoners, and whose only success is the dumping of the products of that labor on other States. Such a law would destroy the arrogant boastfulness of some prison officials, who declare that they can sell their goods against the will and desire of the people of the State in which they dump their unfair products.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.*

In the April and July, 1910, issues of the *American Federationist* we stated our difference with the findings of Mr. Stowe in the *Outlook* relative to contract convict labor and its results in the Maryland Penitentiary at Baltimore and in the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. We were obliged, to our regret, to protest energetically against some of Mr. Stowe's statements. Later, we were constrained to return to the subject, and, moved by our feelings regarding it, handled it without gloves. The trustees of the Maryland Penitentiary, coming to the rescue of

its warden, denied the truth of certain of the facts we had published regarding him. In this up-hill fight to get at the truth of the matter, we admit we were deeply vexed, for, if investigators can not agree upon what are the conditions to be dealt with, what move in any direction can be expected of the public? But now, a distinct advance in reaching a clear view of the heretofore disputed facts is made through the declaration by Mr. Stowe that he was deceived. Here is his letter:

MY DEAR MR. GOMPERS:

In view of our debate on this subject, I am sending you the enclosed copy of my confession of error.

I find on further knowledge of the subject that you were entirely right as to the pernicious effects of prison contract labor in the Maryland Penitentiary, as well as everywhere else. I understand there is an effort now being made to abolish the system in Maryland which I devoutly hope may be successful. I have requested the Baltimore *Sun* to reprint this letter so that I may make all amends possible for circulating the erroneous statements which I then believed to be true.

Respectfully yours,
LYMAN BEECHER STOWE.

53 Washington Square, New York, Jan. 29, 1912.

We at once sent to Mr. Stowe the following reply:

WASHINGTON, *January 31, 1912.*

MR. LYMAN BEECHER STOWE,
53 Washington Square,
New York City.

MY DEAR MR. STOWE:

It is with much pleasure that I read your letter of January 29 and your straightforward, honest acknowledgment of your former erroneous judgment regarding the system and the effect of the contract convict labor system as it obtains in Maryland Penitentiary and as regards the system itself. It is extremely gratifying that we shall all now have your coöperation in the effort to abolish the iniquity of the convict labor contract system and the inauguration of the system of employing convicts in the production of such things as are necessary in the prisons, reformatories, and eleemosynary institutions of the State. I shall be glad to publish your letter in the next issue of the *American Federationist.*

Yours very truly,
SAMUEL GOMPERS,
President, American Federation of Labor.

—*American Federationist, March, 1912.*

Prison reform has not been a mere theory with the workers, but it has been a part of the problems of food, clothing, and house rent. What organized labor has been fighting in prisons is the *contract prison labor system.* Perhaps you know that

under that system the labor power of imprisoned people is sold to some manufacturer who pays the State less than the value of the labor and in addition has the advantage of free factory rent, free supervision of work, and a steady supply of workers. Under the lease system the convicts become the property or slaves of the manufacturer. The convicts receive no wages and are usually forced to toil long hours and at an inhuman speed secured by speeding-up devices.

There are terrible stories told of prison conditions under the contract and lease systems of unspeakable brutality in forcing prisoners to work. Such conditions kill the manhood and the self-respect of those placed there for reformative purposes. They harden hearts and consciences. They make social outlaws. You, the editor of *Harper's Weekly,* do you know how it feels to know that your labor power has been sold to some grinding task-master, who wishes to wring from you that which will add to his profits with never a thought of what happens to your body or soul? Do you, safe in your editorial haven, know how it feels to strain nerves and muscles in physical toil until your very bones are weary, your mind a blank, and your heart a dull, grinding ache of misery? Do you know how it feels to be looked upon as a thing, to be bought and sold, to be used at the will of the owner? Do you know that sense of unfreedom that leaves an indelible scar on the soul of man that makes it impossible for him ever to forgive society for heartlessly, greedily killing the best that is in him in order to give profits to some other man?

If you know these things, in the name of humanity how can you, how dare you, uphold the contract prison labor system? Can you not see that men are infinitely more precious than mere profits? Can not the degradation of human life persuade you that profits reeking with dead hopes and mangled humanity are of no avail to civilization?

Contracts have been made which provided for the production of 450 dozen shirts a day, at 30 cents a dozen, or for labor at 55 cents a day. These are illustrative of innumerable other contracts. With such prices for convict labor, manufacturers who employed free labor were hopelessly unable to compete. As a consequence, free workers were thrown out of employment. They and their families have suffered hunger and all manner of privation because of the contract labor system. Free competition

of convict-made articles with the products of free labor does not result in increasing the number of commodities furnished to the community, because, protected and favored by special conditions and privileges, it has forced fair firms out of fields of production.

We workers have been very close to the problem of earning our daily bread in the sweat of our brows, and we have found the contract prison labor system a menace to free labor and to convicts. Accordingly, we have used every power at our disposal to have this system abolished. . . .

Nor has the prison policy of the trade unions stopped with opposition to the contract prison labor system. We have advocated that prisons and reformatories should be real reformatory institutions—institutions to foster the sacred human individuality, to develop the best instincts that are in those shut off from ordinary intercourse with fellow-men, and to give them some kind of wholesome employment that would enable them to work into some better self. We have maintained that those in prison should work and should be paid for that work, that they should be given every freedom compatible with the purpose for which they are made to live apart, and meanwhile should be safeguarded from exploitation. In the official journal of the American Federation of Labor for February, 1913, was published an address by Governor Oswald West of Oregon, describing his methods for providing such work for prisoners as would awaken their social instincts.

It is most obviously untrue to state that organized labor desires that "many thousands of able-bodied men ought to be supported in prison in idleness, instead of laboring to increase the number of commodities furnished to the community." We wish the men under prison sentence to be employed in such a way that they shall be benefited and not harmed, and so that the products of their labor can not constitute a menace to free labor.—*From open letter to Norman Hapgood, Editor of Harper's Weekly, March 14, 1914.*

HEALTH AND SANITATION

The San Francisco convention of the American Federation of Labor adopted the following:

"Whereas the ravages of tuberculosis have made frightful

progress in this country, and especially among the working class; be it

"Resolved, By this twenty-fourth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, that the necessary ways, means, and steps be at once instituted to check tuberculosis, and, if possible, entirely eradicate the same."

Acting upon this declaration, immediate efforts were made to secure every possible information upon the subject. I corresponded with expert medical practitioners and representatives of associations instituted to combat and eradicate this awful plague, for the purpose of obtaining the fullest information upon this subject. I also made personal visits to some sanitariums with a view of examining into the practicability of such institutions and the results achieved or achievable by them. It is a source of gratification to be enabled to say that more than a cordial coöperation and a desire to still further coöperation and assistance were manifested by all with whom correspondence and conference have been had.

Arrangements were made by which two representatives of the Committee on the Prevention of Tuberculosis of the Charity Organization Society of New York City appeared before the Executive Council members at their Scranton meeting, and the entire subject-matter was fully discussed. An invitation was extended to that association to have a delegation of three appear before and address this convention upon the subject. If practicable or deemed advisable the entire subject-matter should be referred to a special or one of the regular committees of the convention, for the purpose of further consideration and for the formulation of a report to be submitted to you for proper disposition. It is recommended that you at once designate a time for this delegation to address you, which, by agreement, will occupy one hour.

Experiments are being made in various parts of the country to test at once whether tuberculosis (consumption) can be successfully fought by open air treatment, whether it can be done with comparatively small outlay, and whether this aid can be administered without subjecting the recipient to the humiliation of feeling that he is a pauper. The humane, economical and ethical reasons for attempting to solve these questions are surely potent enough to call forth the greatest efforts.

In the first place, the white plague, enervating as it does so large a number, and dooming hundreds of thousands to an early grave, must arouse us and our fellows to action to combat its spread, and to endeavor to prevent its infection. This subject to us is of the utmost importance; this terrible disease though colossal in its proportions, which has destroyed and is destroying the lives of thousands upon thousands of our fellow workmen, comes like the thief in the night, steals away our health and vitality, rendering us an easy and early prey to its poison touch. Particularly is this true of our wage-earners who, under modern industrial conditions, often work long hours in unsanitary workshops and live in unsanitary homes, and because of their meagre earnings, can not secure for themselves and those dependent upon them the requisite nourishing foods so necessary as a barrier against this awful disease. No wonder that overworked men and women, their children and themselves underfed, fall an easy prey to this terrible plague.

The most expert specialists who have considered this subject have declared that the main causes for the propagation of consumption and the difficulty of its cure lie in the "overcrowding of the working classes"; that action of all associated effort, including legislation, should make for the enforcement of a larger minimum per capita air space in workshops, living rooms, schools and halls, and that these would lay the ground-work for better sanitation, ventilation, and sunlight for the prevention of tuberculosis.

We who may be free from that dread disease, and who have not had the awful experience of having some one near and dear to us torn from our sides by the ravages of tuberculosis, may possibly feel an indifference or a secondary interest in this subject; but if we are mindful at all of our own health and the lives or those of our fellows we must have a clear conception of our duty and take every action within our power to effect its eradication; otherwise, lest by our indifference or neglect, it prove a scourge devastating in character and scope.

It has been clearly proven that sanitariums located at great distances from the homes of sufferers are impractical, inadequate, and unsatisfactory. Open air or tent life in locations near to where sufferers live has been found to be adequate, economic, and advantageous.

It is gratifying to find expert testimony justifying the labor movement in its demands for a shorter workday and leisure (relaxation from labor); higher wages to supply man's wants for better and more nourishing food; better sanitation of factory and workshop, and more air space in which to work and live. *—From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Pittsburgh, Pa., November, 1905.*

Of late years, our attitude toward physical well-being has become saner and more constructive. We have begun to appreciate the fact that our problem is to maintain health rather than to cure disease, to prevent physical defects rather than remedy those that have already happened. We have been making an attack upon this problem of physical health through our public school system and through demands for industrial hygiene and sanitation, but as yet our efforts are only beginnings. We are working toward an ideal that will give every individual information that will enable him to live intelligently and in accord with the rules of health.

In the past, we have not been forced by either environment or by conditions to think out a plan for physical training. We have trusted much to the rugged physiques, muscles and nerves trained and under control and ability to coördinate powers quickly to meet emergencies which belong to the outdoor life of a pioneer people. Life on the frontier developed physical strength and virile manhood. Mental and physical weakness could not survive in the dangers of that life. But the frontier has vanished. The majority of our citizens no longer live in the open and they show in their physical development the effect of the restricted life of the city. They have not the physical strength or endurance that would fit them, without further preparation, to be called into service in a citizens' army.

Since opportunities for physical training are not freely and readily available to all, some definite national policy must be devised for physical training and physical preparedness of all citizens. Such a training is properly a part of educational work and, therefore, should be under the control and direction of public agencies, and can be readily given through our public school system and other auxiliary agencies.

Physical development and good health have a very vital mean-

ing in the life and the working ability of each individual as well as of the whole nation. They are just as necessary to the best industrial development of the country as they are to preparedness for defense. These are the basis for all development. But we must be on guard that physical training shall not be subordinated to the interests of any one special phase of national life. It must be in furtherance of a broad general plan of usefulness. Physical training that is narrowly specialized or dominated by any isolated ideal, whether it be militarism or anything else, is subversive to the broadest and largest development of the nation and its people.—*American Federationist, March, 1916.*

Is it wise to open up opportunities for government agents to interfere lawfully with the privacy of the lives of wage-earners? Would such authority be tolerated by employers, by professional men or those directing our financial, industrial and commercial institutions?

Is it not a better way to undertake the problem of assuring to workers health by providing them with the information and the education that will enable them to take intelligent care of themselves and *assuring to them such conditions of work and standards of wages as will enable them to give their information reality in directing and managing their own lives?*

Should the individual worker not be able to accomplish all desirable results, is it not better for him to augment his own efforts by voluntary associate effort, coöperating with his friends and fellow-workers?

Trade organizations are not unmindful of the health problem; in fact, they have done more to secure conditions of sanitation in places of work and to enable workers to have decent healthful homes than any other agency. As the information of the workers increases, they give more thought to problems of health and sanitation. . . .

The workers of America adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems which are held to be not only impractical but a menace to their rights, welfare and liberty. Health insurance legislation affects wage-earners directly. Compulsory institutions will make changes not only in relations of work but in their private lives, particularly a compulsory system affecting health, for good health is not concerned merely with

time and conditions under which work is performed. It is affected by home conditions, social relations and all of those things that go to make up the happiness or the desolation of life.

To delegate to the government or to employers the right and the power to make compulsory visitations under the guise of health conditions of the workers is to permit those agencies to have a right to interfere in the most private matters of life. It is, indeed, a very grave issue for workers. They are justified in demanding that every other voluntary method be given the fullest opportunity before compulsory methods are even considered, much less adopted.—*American Federationist, April, 1916.*

There ought to be assured to every boy and girl adequate opportunity for physical and mental development. This is the cornerstone of national preparedness whether for peace or war.

Undernourished men and women, with bodies poisoned by fatigue, living in conditions deadening to incentive, are a terrible handicap to a nation preparing for a supreme effort requiring endurance and resourcefulness. The emergencies of war have emphasized what was overlooked in times of peace.

English papers publish evidences of the awful legacy of her industrial exploitation. Recruits from factories, shops, habituated to grinding tasks and under conditions physically deleterious, did not have the physique and the endurance necessary to marching or field work. It is stated that battalions of Lancashire recruits had to be kept in the open air and fed properly before ready for service. After some months of open air exercise and adequate food, the uniforms issued to these recruits upon enlistment were exchanged for larger sizes.

Similar experiences have been recorded for Porto Rico, where the majority are undernourished. Those who joined the United States Army and were given regular exercise, clean living quarters with regular, nourishing meals, increased in height on an average of one and a half inches and proportionately in chest and muscular expansion.

Is it not an indictment of civilization and national ideals that adequate opportunity for physical development is generally to be found only in the military? We profess to hold in high esteem the arts of peace, and yet we permit those necessary to those arts to be dwarfed and warped in minds and bodies. . . .

Through the public schools each boy and girl should receive physical training and should be taught physiology and the fundamentals necessary for good health. For students and for all, there should be provided by school and local government authorities opportunities for outdoor exercises and life so that every girl and boy, man and woman, could take care of himself or herself in the open.

Until we are able to keep children in school longer than is now compulsory and to enforce school attendance more strictly, physical training through schools alone will be inadequate. It devolves upon the local government to afford ample opportunities for all and to see to it that all have time to avail themselves of existing agencies and facilities.—*American Federationist, January, 1917.*

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES

For the present, the reclamation of public lands in arid regions, reforestization, development of waterways, the preservation of mineral beds, and the extension of natural reservations, form the groundwork of one of the most important of all the constructive features of the national life. It is a matter of profound interest and gratification to the American people that the convention of governors of States, the forestry, irrigation, and waterway engineering experts and others who have given the public weal their study was called together by the Chief Executive of the nation.

These eminent citizens are gathered in obedience to a call, the inspiration of which strike the key-note of the nation's future policy in the field of civic betterment. It is the extension of the new school of political economy. It is in the nature of the great stewardship that underlies the brotherhood of man. No more noble incentive to that end can be imagined than is to be found in the impulse that prompts wise and far-seeing statesmanship to build and preserve for the future. Happily, too, this convention will act as a check on the marauding instinct so flagrantly exercised in the exploitation of the nation's natural resources by men whose actions have hitherto been sanctioned by law. In respect of waste and extravagance in the economic sense, these marauders have placed the American Republic in a situation unparalleled in economic conservation among the nations. In

one item alone, that of fuel, it is figured out by one of the experts attendant upon this convention that 200,000,000 tons of coal are wasted every year in the mining processes of the nation, which is equal to $200,000,000, every ton of coal being worth a dollar at the mines. Add to this the colossal waste in the exploitation of timber lands, water power, and the like, and we have some faint conception of the load our economic energies are carrying. . . .

Grand indeed is the vista that looms up in the development of ideas and measures here considered. It will require a generation to work out measures here adopted. We are going beneath the harrow that has thus far scratched over our vast domain. Here we have a continent comprising nearly a score of millions of square miles of territory. The question Destiny is asking us is: "What are you going to do with it? How are you going to hand it down to your children and your children's children? Shall that deliverance be in the spirit of reversion to degenerate types now fostered and proclaimed in a vulgar millionairism with alliances amongst the moral and intellectual perverts of foreign aristocracy, or shall it be in the spirit of that rugged, forceful and intelligent manhood and womanhood that breeds and fosters the aristocracy of heart and mind as seen in the outworkings of American idealism as well as economic energy?" . . .

When there shall come to our people a better understanding of the husbanding of our natural resources, the readjustment of economic conditions will not leave out of the equation the men and women of labor who are so essential to our industrial, commercial, political and social welfare; the men and women who perform so great a service to society.—*American Federationist, July, 1908.*

V

POLITICAL POLICY OF ORGANIZED LABOR

I am keenly alive to the fact, and it is patent to all observers, that there are many ills from which the working people of our country suffer. Laws that are passed frequently are of a discriminating character against those who possess nothing but their power to labor. It seems to me that the trades unions, apart from their work of attending to the matters of wages, hours of labor, and unjust conditions of that labor, should extend their thoughts and actions more largely into the sphere and affairs of government. We have a right to demand legislation in the interest of the wage-workers, who form so large a majority and are certainly no unimportant factor to the well-being of our country. The platitudes of our statesmen are hardly sufficient to lull us into a fancied happiness when we feel the real grievances we bear, and are conscious of the wrongs heaped upon us. —*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Baltimore, Md., December, 1887.*

Many delegates may feel the desirability of forming a third, or what is known as an independent, political party; but in view of recent experience I can only say that such action, for the present at least, would be in the extreme unwise. If we are zealous and earnest and desire the enforcement of the eight-hour workday, it will require all we can possibly do to muster our efforts and concentrate our power upon its attainment. The experiences of the past have taught that we may and can obtain great practical results, both political as well as economical, by creating a healthy public opinion if we devote ourselves energetically to our organization, the development and maintenance of our trade unions.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., December, 1888.*

Our affiliated unions are guaranteed autonomy and independence. If they deem independent political action advisable, or if they desire to take political action by which to pledge candidates for public offices, to stand by the advocates of labor measures and reward them, or to punish at the polls those who are inimical to their interests, these are matters entirely relegated to each organization, without dictation or hindrance.

What the convention declared was, that a political party, as a party, known by any name, has no right to representation in the trade union councils. That position is in line with the policy of the labor movement. It is recognized the world over in the trade union movement. It is recognized by a large majority of the political party which forced this question to an issue, and advocated by only a very few, who desire to make the trade unions the tail to their political kite.

At the last convention I took the ground that the trade unions were broad enough and liberal enough to admit of all shades of thought upon the economic, political and social questions. I reiterate that statement, and accentuate it with whatever force or ability may be at my command, and repeat, that good standing membership in a trade union is the first qualification to a voice in the councils of the trade union movement.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Birmingham, Ala., December 14-19, 1891.*

At the last convention a program was submitted to our affiliated organizations for discussion, to be reported upon at this convention. In connection with this matter it is but proper to say that the submission of this program to our organizations was largely accepted by the membership as an indorsement of it by the Federation.

A number of the demands contained in that program have been promulgated in almost every trade union throughout the world, but deftly dove-tailed and almost hidden there is one declaration which is not only controversial, but decidedly theoretical, and which even if founded upon economic truth, is not demonstrable, and so remote as to place ourselves and our movement in an unenviable light before our fellow-workers. If our organization is committed to it, it will unquestionably prevent

many sterling national trade unions from joining our ranks to do battle with us to attain first things first.

It is ridiculous to imagine that the wage-workers can be slaves in employment and yet achieve control at the polls. There never yet existed co-incident with each other autocracy in the shop and democracy in political life. In truth, we have not yet achieved the initial step to the control of public affairs by even a formal recognition of our unions. Nor does the preamble to the program outline the condition of the labor movement of Great Britain accurately. In that country the organized wage-workers avail themselves of every legal and practical means to obtain the legislation they demand. They endeavor to defeat those who oppose and elect those who support, legislation in the interest of labor, and whenever opportunity affords elect a bona fide union man to Parliament and other public offices. The Parliamentary Committee of the British Trades Union Congress is a labor committee to lobby for labor legislation. This course the organized workers of America may with advantage follow, since it is based upon experience and fraught with good results.

He would indeed be shortsighted who would fail to advocate independent voting and political action by union workmen. We should endeavor to do all that we possibly can to wean our fellow-workers from their affiliation with the dominant political parties, as one of the first steps necessary to insure that wage-workers vote in favor of wage-workers' interests, wage-workers' questions, and for union wage-workers as representatives.

During the past year the trade unions in many localities plunged into the political arena by nominating their candidates for public office, and sad as it may be to record, it is nevertheless true, that in each one of these localities politically they were defeated and the trade union movement more or less divided and disrupted.

What the results would be if such a movement were inaugurated under the auspices of the American Federation of Labor, involving it and all our affiliated organizations, is too portentous for contemplation. I need only refer you to the fact that the National Labor Union, the predecessor of the American Federation of Labor, entered the so-called independent political arena in 1872 and nominated its candidate for the presidency of the United States. It is equally true that the National Labor Union

never held a convention after that event. The disorganized condition of labor, with its tales of misery, deprivation and demoralization, from that year until the reorganization of the workers about 1880, must be too vivid in the minds of those who were trade unionists then and are trade unionists now to need recounting by me.

In view of our own experience, as well as the experience of our British fellow unionists, I submit to you whether it would be wise to steer our ship of labor safe from that channel whose waters are strewn with shattered hopes and unions destroyed.

Before we can hope as a general organization to take the field by nominating candidates for office, the workers must be more thoroughly organized and better results achieved by experiments locally. A political labor movement cannot and will not succeed upon the ruins of the trade unions.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Denver, December, 1894.*

Beyond doubt few, if any, will contend that the workers should refuse to avail themselves of their political rights or fail to endeavor to secure such demands which they make by the exercise of their political power. The fact is, however, that our movement distinctly draws the line between political action in the interest of labor and party political action. This was more particularly emphasized at the last convention when it was declared as the settled policy of the American trade-union movement that party political action of whatsoever kind shall have no place in the convention of the American Federation of Labor. . . .

There is, too, an entirely erroneous impression regarding trade-union activity and its influences. It is often imagined and asserted that political action exists exclusively at the ballot box. Nothing can be further from the fact than this. There is not an action which the unions can take, whether it be an increase of wages, an hour more leisure secured for the toilers, a factory rule modified, or even any other condition changed and improved, without it being at the same time a political act, having its political effect and its political influence.

In the same degree that the workers master a greater influence in the conditions and regulations under which they are employed, will their associated voices be heard and heeded in the halls of legislation; their will will be the will of the people, the will of

the nation. Of the importance of organization, better organization, more thorough organization, so that our will may be enforced in all lines of labor's interests, let us never lose sight. —*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, December, 1896.*

Consider this question in a broader view. Do you know what has been done with the system of convict labor in the state of New York and in Pennsylvania, and what was done within the last few months in Ohio to solve that problem, and find work for the prisoner, yet not have his labor come in competition with the labor of free men? Was that secured without political action?

Don't you remember that there was a question submitted to the people of the State of New York by referendum as to abolition of the convict-labor system, or the state-account system, that it should not come in competition with free labor, and it was adopted by an overwhelming vote of the people? Who inaugurated that but the trade unionists of the State of New York? Was that political action?

Who secured the constitutional convention which was held here in Albany, a little more than ten years ago, which adopted that principle as a constitutional provision? Who but the representatives of trade unions? Was that a political action, or not?

The eight-hour law was put upon the statute books of the United States, first by the proclamation of President Grant, in 1869. Who secured that but the representatives of the trade unions? I was 14 years of age at that time. Was that accomplished without political action?

Under the impulse given by the A. F. of L.'s officers, a new feature was interposed in this question of the eight-hour law, so that it should extend to the employees of contractors and subcontractors. In the State of New York, in California, and in some other states that I do not now recall, that feature was enacted. In the State of New York, the court of appeals declared it unconstitutional but this will be overcome by this legislature. . . .

There are some men who can never understand political action unless there is a party. As a matter of fact, there is no worse party-ridden people in the whole world than are the people of

the United States. It is nothing but party, party, your party and my party. It is the abomination of American politics. Men vote for their party regardless of what that party stands for. . . .

The trade unionists of New York State made a fight for the bakers' 10-hour law. It was declared unconstitutional, and I think that no law has been declared null and void with less justification than that one—I so expressed myself publicly at the time—but it was so declared. But the bakers secured the 10-hour workday.

If labor is to wait until the millennium, if we are going to wait until labor elects a majority of the legislature and a governor and then a President of the United States, who shall appoint the justices of the Supreme Court. I am afraid we are going to wait a long time! Trade unionists don't propose to wait so long to secure material improvement in their conditions. They want and will have them now and in the near future.

Trade unionists, by their political action, abolished slavery in Hawaii. It may be news to some of you, but it is true, and no one will deny it if you ask those who know. Hawaii would have been annexed to the United States with slavery existing there, if it had not been for the representatives of the A. F. of L., who insisted upon an amendment to the then pending bill for annexation, providing for abolition of slavery in Hawaii, and it was accomplished.

When Porto Rico was annexed to the United States the old Spanish law prevailed, that any effort of two or more men to secure an increase of wages was a conspiracy to raise the price of labor. Through the action of the American trade unionists we secured its change.

We have secured the lien laws, which guarantee a man his wages when he has worked.

The breaker boys, who work in the mines of Pennsylvania, were liberated through the miners' strike, and the public conscience so shocked that one of the best child labor laws we have was passed in Pennsylvania. Was that political action, or not?

The laws covering mining, safety of appliances, pumps, buttressing the mines, the general safety of life and limb of the miners, the car-coupling law that protected the railroad man from being smashed between the cars that he is trying to couple;

who secured that but labor, the trade unionists? Who secured the safety appliances in the mines, in factories and workshops? Who secured the blowers that are now used to carry off the dust from the polisher and the buffer in the machine shops? What are these, all of them? Do you remember our fight here years ago for the abolition of the tenement house work systems? . . .

In 1881, at the first convention of the A. F. of L., the first general demand was made for the limitation and final exclusion of Chinese immigration from our country.

Over thirty years ago the trade unionists secured the establishment of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Massachusetts. It was the first bureau of the kind ever established in the world. At the request of the A. F. of L. the Department of Labor Statistics was established, and since then bureaus of labor statistics in the several states.

It was at the demand of our Federation that the trade unionists in the several states took up the demand to secure inspectors of factories, shops, mills, mines and tenements.

It was upon the demand of organized labor that the child labor laws have been placed upon the statute books of our several states.

It is our movement that is yet making the fight, assisted by others, while some of those who have lately with gingerly fingers taken up this work deny that labor is serious and in earnest for the final and absolute abolition of child labor.

It was our Federation that secured to the seaman, for the first time in history, the right of ownership in himself; the right to quit his work when his vessel was in safe harbor. It is true that this right exists only for the seamen who are engaged in the American coastwise and in the trade of nearby foreign countries, but it is nevertheless true that the sailors' first dawn of freedom, of ownership in himself, was secured by the trade unionists of our country.

Who created on our shores the largest amount of agitation for Cuba Libre? You who work among Cubans in Spanish shops in this city and in Chicago and in San Francisco and in St. Louis, know to whom I refer; and isn't it true that the representatives of our union were emphatic in their assistance in arousing the conscience of the American people that there should be free Cuba? It was a sympathetic strike, if anything ever was, that

compelled the government of America to take action to see that Cuba was freed. . . .

At Scranton the convention, in 1901, adopted the following:

"We assert it is the duty of all trade unions to publish in their official journals, to discuss in their meetings, and the members to study in their homes, all questions of public nature, having reference to industrial or political liberty, and to give special consideration to subjects directly affecting them as a class, but we as vigorously submit that it is not within the power of this organization to dictate to members of our unions to which political party they shall belong or which party's ticket they shall vote." . . .

Labor has never yet formed parties or undertaken to form one but what the control has been wheedled out of their hands by a lot of faddists, theorists or self-seekers, and thus perverted from its true labor interest and working-class characteristics. This is true the whole world over, wherever that attempt has been made.—*From address before Cigar Makers' Union No. 144, of New York City, on the question, "Can Trade Unions Longer Keep Out of Politics?" April 27, 1906.*

Much interest has been aroused by reason of the presentation of Labor's Bill of Grievances to President Roosevelt, Mr. Frye, President *pro tempore* of the Senate, and Speaker Cannon. It has created no little stir among congressmen and senators and other politicians. It will be remembered that the Bill of Labor's Grievances presented to those responsible for legislation or for the failure of legislation contained the following closing paragraphs:

Labor brings these its grievances to your attention because you are the representatives responsible for legislation and for failure of legislation.

The toilers come to you as your fellow-citizens who, by reason of their position in life, have not only with all other citizens an equal interest in our country, but the further interest of being the burden-bearers, the wage-earners of America.

As labor's representatives we ask you to redress these grievances, for it is in your power so to do.

Labor now appeals to you, and we trust that it may not be in vain.

But if perchance you may not heed us, we shall appeal to the conscience and the support of our fellow-citizens. . . .

Pray! when has it become wrong to request or to demand from congressmen that they afford relief to those who feel burdened or to ask for redress from wrongful legislation or unjust conditions?

How, under our form of government, with the sovereign right of franchise in the hands of the working people alike with all other people, is it either improper or unjustifiable for the toilers to express their dissatisfaction with the course which congressmen pursue, and to say that unless satisfactory legislation is enacted the workers will manifest their preference for another citizen as their representative or senator, and thus encompass the defeat of the men or parties which refuse to comply with the requests or demands of labor?

Of course, to act as indicated conveys an implied threat. It is a threat which is made, and will continue to be made, by those who have interests to serve and principles to advance.

Protectionists threaten free-traders; gold-standard men threatened free-silverites, and vice versa. Corporate interests threaten (where they can not buy) congressmen whose predilections are to afford the people relief from unjust conditions.

How, then, can it be wrong for the wage-earners and those who sympathize with them to demand that congressmen shall lend a more willing ear to the just demands of labor, and to undertake to exercise their sovereign right of American citizenship in the defeat of those who misrepresent them, and to elect others in their places more friendly disposed?

As a matter of fact, the right of sovereign citizenship, the ballot, is in its very essence not only a threat, but the means to enforce the threat to defeat those who oppose, and elect those who are favorably disposed to further the interests of the citizen.

Labor in this action is entirely within its lawful and moral rights, and is entirely justified in the exercise of its political as well as its economic power.—*American Federationist, June, 1906.*

It is not surprising that many good citizens heretofore only had a vague notion of labor's demands and the sound logic upon which they were based; but the launching of our campaign, aye, even the denunciation by the hostile portion of the press, has caused a great accession of public interest.

Discussion means that all sides of a question come in for a hearing. The desire of the general public to know what our campaign is about has given labor's representatives a greater opportunity than ever before to present our claims and to show that they are founded upon justice, a patriotic and humane de-

sire to help all our people. The American desire to deal honestly and fairly with propositions which merit such treatment, helps our cause beyond measure.

It is surprising to many who have not hitherto studied the subject to find that while we made a clear-cut and definite campaign on certain issues, including, for instance, the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills; these and all labor's demands seriously concern every citizen, irrespective of whether he be a member of organized labor or whether he is a wage-earner.

Truth is an eternal verity, and our cause needs only to be understood in order to win the support of all sympathetic, patriotic and right-principled men.

We gain by every discussion. We gain even by every hostile attack which provokes comment and gives an opportunity to show what is the truth in regard to our cause. The discussion of the specific measures which labor advocates has led to a consideration of the basic, economic propositions and philosophy upon which such demands are founded. Many so-called statesmen no less than the multitude of private citizens have found that our campaign has forced a more careful study of problems which heretofore have been passed over with conventional phrases which cover ignorance of important subjects.

We repeat, a great educational work was begun many years ago, and has been continually carried on day after day as well as in our recent campaign. It will continue until full justice has been accorded to labor.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Minneapolis, Minn., November, 1906.*

Our conventions have frequently declared that our movement has neither the right nor the desire to dictate how a member shall cast his vote. It has been my privilege and honor always so to insist. I have not departed, and can not now, depart from that true trade union course. At the Minneapolis convention the following declaration was adopted:

"We must have with us in our economic movement men of all parties as well as of all creeds, and the minority right of the humblest man to vote where he pleases and to worship where his conscience dictates must be sacredly guarded."

That solemn and binding declaration is the guarantee to every member of our organized labor movement; and though it be true

that now, as never before in the history of the labor movement of our country have the people been so practically unanimous in their determination to make the contest for justice and right and freedom as in the campaign which will have come to a close before I submit this to you, yet if there were but one man in all our movement who chose for himself to vote and cast his lot contrary to the practically unanimous determination of the great rank and file, that is a right which our movement can not and must not deny him. . . .

The Executive Council called a conference at Washington in 1906, where the historic "Bill of Grievances" was adopted, which was presented to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House. Congress continued indifferent, aye, became still more hostile, for it annulled part of the eight-hour law so far as it applied to the construction of the Panama Canal, but our demonstration had the effect of the President issuing an order for the enforcement of the existing eight-hour law which, upon various occasions for more than two years previous, I had vainly urged him to enforce. . . .

Finding the majority in Congress indifferent and inimical to our grievances, the campaign was undertaken to secure the election of men true to labor, and the defeat of our most conspicuous opponents. Several of those hostile to labor's interests were defeated, the majority in Congress in 1906 was reduced fully one-half and the majority of those of our opponents elected, heavily cut down.

The campaign inaugurated by labor in 1906, being the first conspicuous effort to punish labor's enemies at the polls, increased their anger and aggravated their antagonism. The Speaker, who had "packed" committees not only against labor but against any other real reform legislation, was brazenly re-elected, and to accentuate his bitter and relentless determination to block effective legislation, he so appointed his committees as to make absolutely sure of the impossibility of having bills objectionable to him and the "interests" he represents from even being reported for the consideration of Congress.

In following that vindictive policy, he punished the Representative in Congress, Mr. Pearre, who had the courage to reintroduce our bill to regulate the issuance of the injunction writ

and to prevent its abuse. Speaker Cannon refused to reappoint Mr. Pearre as a member of the Judiciary Committee, a committee upon which he had served ably and conspicuously in two preceding Congresses.

Injunctions continued to be issued in constantly more aggravated form, until the injunction was issued by Justice Gould, December 18, 1907, against the more than two millions members of the organizations of the American Federation of Labor, as well as against the Executive Council. Free speech and free press were denied and then followed the Supreme Court decision in the Danbury Hatters' case, classing our unions as trusts, corporations, monopolies, conspiracies and combinations in illegal restraint of trade, with all the liabilities of three-fold damages, fines of $5,000, and imprisonment for a year.

When the events recorded, and others too numerous to mention, transpired, they developed and culminated into an acute state of feeling among the workers of the country. The right of exercising the peaceful, normal, and natural activities of the workers was outlawed, the very existence of our united efforts imperilled, constitutional rights of free speech and free press were invaded and denied, and the hostile frame of mind of Congress clearly emphasized.

At this time came demands from our fellow-workers all over the country in the form of resolutions and otherwise, all of them urging that a definite course be pursued by our Federation relative to the new conditions which had arisen.

The adverse decisions and injunctions of courts and the hostility of Congress created an unsettled and anxious state of mind among our fellow-workers throughout the country. A number of central bodies adopted resolutions demanding that the Executive Council call a mass convention to take political action in some form or other, and declaring that in the event that this was not done by a specific date, they would themselves inaugurate such a movement. The greater number, however, expressed their devotion to our movement by declaring themselves willing to follow whatever course upon which the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor might decide.

It was in consideration of this situation that a meeting of the Executive Council was called at Washington, beginning March 16. Upon the authority of my colleagues an invitation was ex-

tended to the responsible officers of the international unions to participate in a conference at Washington, March 18, 1908.

It was there and then that the Protest Conference, together with the Executive Council, formulated and presented the "Protest to Congress," and it is my earnest hope that you will again read that historic document in connection herewith. It sets forth clearly the grounds of our complaint and the basis of our protest. The closing words of that protest I feel it necessary to quote:

"As the authorized representatives of the organized wage-earners of our country, we present to you in the most conservative and earnest manner that protest against the wrongs which they have to endure and some of the rights and relief to which they are justly entitled. There is not a wrong for which we seek redress, or a right to which we aspire, which does not or will not be equally shared by all the workers—by all the people.

"While no Member of Congress or party can evade or avoid his or their own individual or party share of responsibility, we aver that the party in power must and will by labor and its sympathizers be held primarily responsible for the failure to give the prompt, full, and effective Congressional relief we know to be within its power.

"We come to you not as political partisans, whether republicans, democrats, or other, but as representatives of the wage-workers of our country whose rights, interests, and welfare have been jeopardized and flagrantly, woefully disregarded and neglected. We come to you because you are responsible for legislation, or the failure of legislation. If these, or new questions, are unsettled, and any other political party becomes responsible for legislation, we shall press home upon its representatives and hold them responsible, equally as we now must hold you."

This protest and demand were signed by the Executive Council and by the officers and representatives of the very large number of international unions participating in the conference. Labor's "Protest to Congress" was published in the April (1908) *American Federationist*.

The same conference adopted an "Address to Organized Labor and Farmers of the Country." In that address the same signers declared that:

"We have appealed to Congress for the necessary relief we deem essential to safeguard the interests and rights of the toilers.

"We now call upon the workers of our common country to

"Stand faithfully by our friends,

"Oppose and defeat our enemies, whether they be

"Candidates for President,

"For Congress, or other offices, whether

"Executive, legislative, or judicial.

"Each candidate should be questioned and pledged as to his attitude upon all subjects of importance to the toilers, whether of factory, farm, field, shop or mine.

"We again renew and hereby declare our complete and abiding faith in the trade union movement to successfully accomplish the amelioration of economic conditions befitting all of our people. The historical past of our movement, its splendid achievements in labor's behalf, and magnificent present standing warrants the assertion and justifies our prediction for its future success.

"We, the representatives of the national and international trade unions and farmers' organizations, represented in this conference, call upon the Executive Council and upon all labor to use every possible legitimate effort to secure for the workers their inalienable liberties and their proper recognition as a vital portion of the fabric of our civilization. We pledge ourselves to use every lawful and honorable effort to carry out the policy agreed upon at this conference. We pledge our industrial, political, financial, and moral support to our own members and to our friends wherever found, not only for the present time, but for the continuous effort which may be necessary for success. We pledge ourselves to carry on this work until every industrial and political activity of the workers is guaranteed its permanent place and usefulness in the progress of our country.

"Let labor not falter for one instant; the most grave and momentous crisis ever faced by the wageworkers of our country is now upon us.

"Our industrial rights have been shorn from us and our liberties are threatened.

"It rests with each of us to make the most earnest, impressive and law-abiding effort that lies within our power to restore these liberties and safeguard our rights for the future if we are to save the workers and mayhap even the nation itself from threatened disaster.

"This is not a time for idle fear.

"Let every man be up and doing. Action consistent, action persistent, action insistent is the watchword."

The Protest Conference urged the workers of the country to hold meetings and to pass resolutions expressive of their purpose, demanding legislation at the hands of Congress before it adjourned, and declaring for the alternative course adopted as governing the course of the participants in the conference if it met their approval. The mass meetings were held by workers in factory, workshop, mill, mine, farm, and field. The indorsement and approval of the measures recommended by the Protest Conference were practically unanimous.

Desirous of pressing labor's demands home upon the majority in control in Congress, five additional organizers were called in from the field of their other activities, and added to the two already at Washington to act as labor's legislative committee. They made the most strenuous efforts, and it is doubtful if a

single member of Congress in attendance escaped being interviewed as to his willingness to work and vote for the legislation essential to the workers. With members of the Executive Council our legislative committee appeared before the Congressional committees to argue our cause and present our claims, but all to no avail.

The leaders of the minority party in Congress declared their willingness and their purpose unitedly to aid the majority or any part of the majority to enact the legislation which labor asked; but the members of the dominant party in Congress had set their hearts like flint; they had no ears to hear, no patience to heed any claim, argument, or appeal involving the principles of equal rights to equality before the law, or of the liberty of the workers on a par with other citizens of our country.

Congress adjourned with the defiant declaration of one of the Republican leaders in Congress and recent candidate of that party for the Vice-Presidency, Mr. James Sherman, that "the Republican Party is responsible for legislation or for the failure of legislation," and that he and his party were willing to assume the responsibility.

I strongly urge you and every worker and student of the cause of labor to again read the report of the Federation legislative committee published in the August issue, 1908, of the *American Federationist*. It reveals a tale of perfidy to the common weal and in telling the truth, perforce besmirches the name and history of a political party that found its embodiment of idealism in the martyred Lincoln.

When Congress adjourned, after so shamelessly refusing to accord the workers the relief and the rights upon which they had set their hearts and hopes, the feeling became still more tense among the great rank and file of labor. The Executive Council then decided to appeal from the action of Congress to the representatives of the two great political parties in convention assembled.

As already stated, we presented identical demands to the Republican and the Democratic Party conventions. In the one instance, that of the Republican convention, the declarations adopted were for the enactment of a law that would legalize the worst abuse and perversion of the injunction writ, this in direct opposition to what we had asked. The Democratic Party, in con-

vention at Denver, adopted labor's demands and incorporated them in its party platform.

In view of the specific declarations of the men of labor throughout our country for many years, the repeated declarations and instructions of the American Federation of Labor at many of its conventions, some of which I have quoted, it devolves upon you, the duly constituted representatives of the men of labor of our country, you who come here and who have been in immediate and constant touch with the toilers of America, it is for you to say whether the course pursued, to stand faithfully by our friends and elect them, oppose our enemies and defeat them, whether they be candidates for President, for Congress, or other offices, is justified, and meets with your approval, or your condemnation.

The men of labor realize that our liberties as workers and as citizens are threatened; that our industrial efforts to work for labor's rights and interests upon natural and rational lines are outlawed, and that if it is the desire and aspiration of America's toilers to work along these peaceful, natural lines of historic development, these rights and liberties must be restored.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Denver, Col., November,* 1908.

We must be partisan for a principle and not for a party, but we must make manifest the fact that we have political power and that we intend to use it; otherwise the ballot will become an impotent weapon. Our members and friends can not expect that the officers of the Federation can impress either upon political parties or upon Congress the demands of the workers for justice and right unless those workers themselves have shown sufficient interest in the use of their political power as to make it clear that they are the potent force behind their chosen officers and representatives. The potency of the ballot begins in the primary, independent of a party, and there the workers must begin to assert their adherence to labor's principles and demands. There the workers make of themselves an educational force. They must endeavor to draw with them those unorganized, perhaps, or who have not yet become familiar with the legislation which is needed.

Let us restate that there can be no coercion of any man along

party lines. Labor must learn to use parties to advance our principles, and not allow political parties to manipulate us for their own advancement. The distinction is easily understood and readily carried into effect. If each worker as an individual uses the ballot for the advancement of the principles for which labor stands and has declared there will be no question in future as to the power of labor to achieve its just demands; political apathy and partisan adherence will weaken; political activity and partisanship for labor's principles will bring strength and success. The activity, the loyalty of the workers in every part of the country is what we need in order that our political power may be used harmoniously with our economic efficiency. The time is now for emphatic declaration and positive, practical preparation for action.—*From report to A. F. of L. Convention, Toronto, Ont., Canada, November, 1909.*

Trade unionists refuse "to shift the ground largely to the political field"—that is, the partisan political field in the sense employed by the *Call.* National unions of labor in America, prior to the formation of the American Federation of Labor, made that shift, charmed with the voice of political sirens, and wrecked their craft on the Lorelei rocks of dissension. They disintegrated. Their wreckage forms a warning to the present day. . . .

The problem of labor politics lies in doing the possible things that may justly free the masses from any of the burdens under which they labor and which are consequent upon the present iniquities of society. To the practical propositions of the socialists toward that end, union labor ever gives due consideration. To the eventual form of society for which socialists allege they yearn, however, trade unionists in general find themselves unable to give support, since, as a matter of fact, that form has for forty years been steadily undergoing the changes of dissolving views.

The "conservatism" of the American Federation of Labor, therefore, is no more than the holding fast to that which has proved to be good, within the limits of trade union operation, during the vicissitudes of labor organization in its various forms in this country for more than a century. The masses of wage-workers in the different occupations have found their way to agreement in united action for certain immediate economic aims,

the first of them being accomplished through acts bearing directly on the labor market. The beneficial results thus attained are too highly prized to be risked in the political ventures of a crude utopianism.—*American Federationist, February, 1912.*

Just a word as to the different ways the American trade unionists and the English trade unionists have approached public questions. For more than thirty years there has been some representative of English workingmen in the Parliament of England. I think that the dean of the workingmen in the House of Commons is an English coal miner elected as a coal miner and the representative of the miners and other workingmen who are incidentally employed in the mining districts, elected not as a Liberal or a Conservative, but by Labor Liberals, I think it would be fair to say. When the courts of England made their decision in the Taff-Vale case it made the funds of the unions of England liable to be mulcted in damages by employers, and gave a new and unexpected interpretation to the existing law, if I may say so, just exactly as the courts of this country have interpreted the Sherman Anti-trust law to make that law apply to the organizations of the working people. When that was done the British workingmen realized that they were about to be placed in the same position as the old guilds of about three centuries ago, subject to confiscation at the will and the fancy of the king. They were aroused. They held public meetings, and in their organization meetings and in their national congresses they decided upon the inauguration of a campaign for the repeal, or rather for an amendment to the law that would annul the decision or would overcome the decision of the courts of England in the Taff-Vale case. This resulted in the enactment by Parliament of what is known as the British Trades Dispute Act of 1906. With that came the launching of the Independent Labor Party by the workingmen and the election of, I think, forty-two members of the House of Commons, and then in the last election, I think, there were fifty-three members of the House of Commons elected who are labor men—union men. The Independent Labor Party is a fairly established party in England. In this country the trade unionists have sought to throw the weight of their influence for those particular men whom they believe to be most favorable to those things for which the labor

unionists stand. Whether a candidate is favorable or unfavorable to the position we take is largely determined by the candidate himself. We judge that by his votes. . . .

The American Federation of Labor has no power at all, nor does it pretend to exercise any power to control the individual action of the individual voter. Speaking now as its President, I have always endeavored to make that clear. As a matter of fact, during the 1908 campaign it was studiously circulated and repeated time and time again by the spellbinders who were opposed to us that I had pledged the 2,000,000 votes of the workmen to the Democratic Party, that I carried the workmen's votes around in my vest pocket, etc. I took occasion to say that I could dictate the vote of not more than one citizen in the United States; that I have three sons, all of them voters, and I could not, if I would, and would not if I could, dictate how they should vote; that the only one vote I could control was my own. I tried to emphasize that fact upon every occasion. . . .

We submitted the first publication of campaign expenses. We printed our financial statement of that campaign [1912] before any other political party or political factor did so. The committee which was organized for the purpose of securing legislation for the publicity of campaign accounts, contributions, and expenditures, complimented the American Federation of Labor upon having issued the first publication of that character.

The funds were voluntary contributions. In the campaign of 1908 there was some little money from the general funds used for publication, but not in the succeeding campaigns. . . .

In our political activities we have never paid money to members of Congress as a reward for services rendered the cause of labor, nor offered any other consideration; nothing but our cordial support if we could be of assistance to them politically. We have never had money enough, and no matter how much money we might have we would never contribute anything toward their campaigns or to them in any way. . . . Since and including March, 1895, the American Federation of Labor has published its income and its expenditures every month for the preceding month, and there has been no deviation from that course month by month. During the political campaigns in which we were specifically interested, we appealed for financial assistance—voluntary financial assistance. We published little leaflets con-

taining the amounts received and by whom contributed, and the amounts expended and to whom and for what purpose paid. . . .

Why should we not have our labor representatives here as our legislative committee? Why should we not have representation in Congress? Why should we not have a representative in the Cabinet of the United States? In not less than eight countries in Europe, and in several countries in America, there is a department of labor, with a distinctively labor man from the ranks of the workers, or rather still in the ranks until selected for high office, at the head of the department. It is a recognition of the transition of society. It is an acknowledgment of the extending of the scope of government from the merely and purely political to the industrial and social.—*From abstract of testimony before House Lobby Investigation Committee, Washington, D. C., December, 1913.*

One great advantage of the [political] policy the A. F. of L. has pursued is that it has in no way hampered or detracted from the economic power or effectiveness of the trade unions. Nonpartisan political activity does not subordinate the economic interests of the trade unionists to partisan interests but our political policy has made our economic influence, our economic needs, our economic welfare of paramount importance. The paramount issue of our political campaign was the enactment into law of legislation that would assure the legal right to organize and secure for labor organizations the legal right to perform those activities necessary to carry out the purposes of the economic organizations.—*American Federationist, February, 1917.*

Political conditions are such in the United States that the wage-earners have been united to one or the other of the two strong, political parties and that they are bound to these parties by ties of fealty and of tradition. It would take years ever to separate any considerable number of workers from their fealty to the old party. In addition to these, economic interests such as tariff policies are a strong factor in determining the party allegiance of wage-earners. The formation of a new party would mean the formulation of a complete political program for the wage-earners. In drawing up such a policy it would be impossible to avoid controversial questions and hence it would be impossible

to secure the united action of the wage-earners upon all questions. However, it is a very simple and natural thing to secure united action upon fundamentals. Alliance in any party already formed would be responsible for the practices and purposes of that party and responsible for its "practical politics."

If this policy were adopted success could be achieved only when the party with which the alliance was made came into power. To those who have studied the psychology of partisan politics it requires only a reference to disclose the disadvantages of this policy. Party success carries with it the necessity for party rewards. The party assumes the responsibility for legislation and for administration. It is placed in the position of defense. Such an alliance would make it necessary for the workers to use part of their power in defending the administration and thereby reduce their effectiveness in fighting for their own legislation. . . .

Without forming a political party, without forming any new organizations, without additional expenditure of trade union funds, all except one of the demands contained in the Bill of Grievances have become the law of the land. The passage of the Immigration law, the last demand removed from the list, illustrates the distinctive political power which organized labor has developed since 1906. The proposal to restrict immigration was not a partisan measure.—*American Federationist, March, 1917.*

The *New Republic* holds that radical changes in society of a constructive character can be secured only through a political program carried into effect by a political party. The *New Republic* has failed to think its problem through. Radical changes in society are not brought about by altering the outside forms. They must begin with the individual as manifested through the expression of individual will and creative effort. These changes are fundamental and deal with the things of every-day life and work. Changes in standards of living, conditions of work, and the freeing of individual will from repression, result in different spiritual forces that through collective constructive effort will revolutionize the organization of society. Until these radical fundamental changes are brought about, superficial changes coming through legislation would be without avail.—*American Federationist, August, 1918.*

An independent political labor party becomes either radical, so-called, or else reactionary, but it is primarily devoted to one thing and that is vote-getting. Every sail is trimmed to the getting of votes. The question of the conditions of labor, the question of the standards of labor, the question of the struggles and the sacrifices of labor, to bring light into the lives and the work of the toilers—all that is subordinated to the one consideration of votes for the party.

I have read the fourteen points which have been formulated for the proposed Labor Party here. Is there one of them of an essential character to the interests and welfare of the working people of the United States which is not contained in the curriculum, the work and the principles of the bona fide labor movement of our country? . . .

The organization of a political labor party would simply mean the dividing of the activities and allegiance of the men and women of labor between two bodies, such as would often come in conflict.

In the British Trade Union Congress at Derby there were divergent views. There were four different points of view upon one subject before the Congress. In order to try to unite the thought a committee of four was appointed for the purpose of trying to bring in some agreed proposition and recommendation for adoption by the Congress. In the course of a few days the committee reported a resolution. For the purpose of conserving time the four members of the committee representing the divergent views were called upon in turn to express their views. Each in turn expressed his own view and placed his own construction upon the resolution recommended. Then each declared that he was going out to fight for his own view. . . .

Suppose in 1912 we had had a labor party in existence; do you think for a moment that we could have gone as the American labor movement to the other political parties and said: "We want you to inaugurate in your platform this and this declaration." If one of the parties had refused and the other party consented and took its chance, would the American Federation of Labor have been permitted to exercise that independent political and economic course if the labor party had been in existence? How long would we have had to wait for the passage of a law by Congress declaring in practice and in principle that the labor

of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce—the most far-reaching declaration ever made by any government in the history of the world.—*From address "Should a Political Party be Formed?"; at Labor Conference, New York City, December 9, 1918.*

In the political efforts, arising from the workers' necessity to secure legislation covering those conditions and provisions of life not subject to collective bargaining with employers, organized labor has followed two methods; one by organizing political parties, the other by the determination to place in public office representatives from their ranks; to elect those who favor and champion the legislation desired and to defeat those whose policy is opposed to labor's legislative demands, regardless of partisan politics.

The disastrous experience of organized labor in America with political parties of its own amply justified the American Federation of Labor's non-partisan political policy. The results secured by labor parties in other countries never have been such as to warrant any deviation from this position. The rules and regulations of trade unionism should not be extended so that the action of a majority could force a minority to vote for or give financial support to any political candidate or party to whom they are opposed. Trade union activities cannot receive the undivided attention of members and officers if the exigencies, burdens and responsibilities of a political party are bound up with their economic and industrial organizations.

The experiences and results attained through the non-partisan political policy of the American Federation of Labor cover a generation. They indicate that through its application the workers of America have secured a much larger measure of fundamental legislation, establishing their rights, safeguarding their interests, protecting their welfare and opening the doors of opportunity than have been secured by the workers of any other country.

The vital legislation now required can be more readily secured through education of the public mind and the appeal to its conscience, supplemented by energetic political activity on the part of trade unionists, than by any other method. This is and will continue to be the political policy of the American Federation of Labor, if the lessons which labor has learned in the

bitter but practical school of experience are to be respected and applied.

It is therefore most essential that the officers of the American Federation of Labor, the officers of the affiliated organizations, state federations and central labor bodies and the entire membership of the trade union movement should give the most vigorous application possible to the political policy of the American Federation of Labor, so that labor's friends and opponents may be more widely known, and the legislation most required readily secured. This phase of our movement is still in its infancy. It should be continued and developed to its logical conclusion.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlantic City, N. J., June, 1919.*

VI

LABOR'S PLACE IN MODERN PROGRESS

In the branch of industry in which I work we have to contend with a curse known as the manufacturing of cigars in tenement houses, in which the employer hires a row of tenements four or five stories high, with two, three or four families living on each floor, occupying a room and bed-room, or a room, bed-room, and an apology for a kitchen. The tobacco for the work is given out by the manufacturer or his superintendent to the operatives who work there, the husband and wife, and they seldom work without one or more of their children, if they have any. Even their parents, if they have any, work also in the room, and any indigent relative that may live with them also helps along. I myself made an investigation of these houses about two years ago; went through them and made measurements of them, and found that however clean the people might desire to be they could not be so. The bedroom is generally dark, and contains all the wet tobacco that is not intended for immediate use, but perhaps for use on the following day; while in the front room (or back room, as the case may be) the husband and wife and child, or any friend or relative that works with them, three or four or five persons, are to be found. Each has a table at which to work. The tobacco which they work and the clippings or cuttings, as they are termed, are lying around the floor, while the scrap or clip that is intended to be used immediately for the making of cigars is lying about to dry. Children are playing about as well as their puny health will permit them, in the tobacco. I have found, I believe, the most miserable conditions prevailing in those houses that I have seen at any time in my life. . . . The yards were all dirty. The halls were kept very dirty with tobacco stems and refuse that accumulates from the tobacco. . . . The water-closets are all

vaults, in very few places connected with sewers, vaults in the back yard, around which a few boards have been nailed. . . . The water supply is very meagre indeed. . . .

From the year 1873 to 1878 the cigar-makers of this country were reduced in wages systematically *every spring and every fall.* The reductions in wages were sometimes large and sometimes not quite so large, but a reduction was the order of the day at those periods. At that time the cigar-makers' organization was in a very weak and puerile condition. Further, the manufacturers of cigars throughout that period managed to introduce a system of truck or "pluck-me" payments, by which the workingmen were paid in kind, cigars, and were required to go out and sell them to any grogshop or other place of any description where they could sell them; or they would receive store orders, or, in the case of single men, they would be required to board at certain hotels or boarding houses. In the city of Elmira, in this State, a manufacturer paid his workingmen $6. per thousand if they were taking their wages out in truck or kind, while he paid only $5. a thousand to those single men who were in boarding houses, and but $4. a thousand to those cigar-makers who wanted cash, legal tender. . . . In these last two years . . . I am convinced that we have had over one hundred and sixty or one hundred and seventy strikes, and the strikes have been successful except in, perhaps, twenty instances, where they may have been lost or compromised. The truck system of which I spoke exists no longer in our trade. . . .

One of the most hard-worked class of people under the sun, the freight-handlers of the city of New York . . . are a body of men, very sinewy, working for 17 cents an hour for the railroad corporations. Last year they had the hardihood to ask for three cents more an hour, making 20 cents an hour, when the railroads informed them that they would not pay it. The freight-handlers were, after a struggle, starved into submission, and are working now for 17 cents an hour. . . . He [the freight handler] generally lives in very poor quarters; his home is but scantily furnished; he can eat only of the coarsest food; his children, like too many others, are frequently brought into the factories at a very tender age; in some instances his wife takes in sewing and does chores for other people, while in other instances that I know of they work in a few of the remaining laundries where women are

still engaged, the work not having been absorbed by the Chinese. By this means the home, of course, is broken up; indeed there is hardly the semblance of a home, and in these instances where the wife goes out to work no meal is cooked. Many of the stores have for sale dried meats or herrings, cheese, or some other article which does not require any cooking. Of course, when the wife is at home, although the living is very poor, it is cooked; she cooks what can be purchased with the portion of the 17 cents per hour remaining after the payment of rent, and the cost of light, fuel, etc. . . .

The car-drivers of the city of New York are working from fourteen to sixteen hours a day in all weathers, and receive $1.75 a day. . . . His meals are served to him by his wife or friend or child, as the case may be, in a kettle, while he is driving his team, and at the end of the route he may possibly have two or three minutes to swallow his food. It is nothing more than swallowing it, and when he comes home he is probably too tired or perhaps too hungry to eat. . . . In some instances men who do not and cannot live, on account of the meagreness of their wages, on the route of the railroad, are compelled to live at some distance, and when they have these relays or switches it takes them sometimes twenty or thirty minutes to reach their homes, and to return again takes another half or three-quarters of an hour. . . . The actual service is from fourteen to fifteen hours. Then there is the looking after their horses and cleaning the car besides. . . . The car drivers have to stand all the time. . . . They sometimes rest back against the door of the car for a while. They also, in some instances, have to act as conductors; that is, give change, count the passengers, and register the number of passengers on an indicator. And then they are sometimes held responsible when somebody is run over on account, perhaps, of their having to perform two men's work. . . .

Among some of the tailoresses in the city I have made a personal investigation. They make a regular heavy pantaloon, working pants, for seven cents a pair. They are capable of making ten pairs per day of twelve hours. Boys' pantaloons they make for five to six cents per pair, making fourteen to sixteen pairs per day of twelve hours. They work mostly seven full days in the week; sometimes they will stop on Sunday afternoon, but all work on Sunday, and their average weekly wage is about $3.81,

providing no time is lost. They are compelled to provide their own cotton out of this, and their own needles and thimbles, and other small things that are necessary in the work. Overalls and jumpers (a kind of calico jacket used by laborers in warm weather sometimes, to prevent the dirt getting to the shirt or underclothing) they make for thirty to thirty-five cents per dozen. They generally work in "teams" of two, and they make about three dozen per day, or in a working day of thirteen to fifteen hours they earn from forty-five to fifty-two and a half cents each. They work generally in the shop but usually finish some work at home on Sunday.

From testimony before United States Senate Committee upon the Relations between Labor and Capital (Henry W. Blair, chairman), August 16, 1883.

That we are still far from the goal for which the human family have been for ages struggling is due to our own shortcomings. There is no reason why we should not realize the highest hopes of an ideal life, where man's worth shall be measured by his real utility to his fellows, where his generosity and sympathy, rather than his cupidity and rapacity, will receive the encomiums and rewards of a nobler manhood, a more beautiful womanhood and a happier childhood; where justice and fair dealing will redound to the advantage and the ennobling of all. To the attainment of that end we should bend our every energy, subordinate our every other aspiration.—*From Annual Report of A. F. of L. Convention, Philadelphia, December, 1892.*

The earth was intended for all mankind, and not for a few. The question of how they are going to get their rights can only be solved by the organized labor movement—not by revolution, but by evolution. The true object of the labor movement is the seeking of a rational method by which these wrongs can be righted. It was born out of hunger for food at first, and then grew with the hunger for better homes, better lives and higher aspirations and ideals. Now it is the living protest against the wrong and is the effort of the masses to improve the conditions. No one is educated who has not given the matter his study and attention.—*From address in Wesley Chapel, Cincinnati, December 20, 1896.*

No market for industry or commerce is so conducive to true civilization as the home market, based upon the ever increasing and improving demands of our people.—*American Federationist, April, 1899.*

In our present economic condition of society we have with a very great degree of regularity a period of these industrial panics that the student can determine almost with the exactness that an astronomer does of the comets, the coming of these periods of industrial crises. Quite a number do not observe this economic phenomenon. The worker knows that during these industrial panics he is out of a job; and you might have all the philosophy in the world, all the facts in the world to demonstrate the truthfulness of your position, but he is out of a job, and he can not understand that there has been any social improvement, not even that he has improved beyond the condition of his forefathers ten centuries ago; he knows he is out of a job, and he is hungry, and the prospects of something in the future are very remote, and to him the world has been growing worse all the time; the world is in an awful condition, and it is in an awful condition truly, and we must remember this, when we consider the social progress; we must not compare this year with the last, or last year with the year before, but compare it for a century by decades, then the marvelous progress can be easily observed. . . . Most of us young men can go back 20 or 30 years; we can mark the condition, and that which we do not know of our own knowledge we can ascertain of truthful records.

[Q. To what do you attribute the vastly superior condition of the American workingmen over the European; the social condition; the advanced, you might say scale of wages paid in America over the European condition?] First, the working people of Europe have emerged from a condition of slavery and serfdom to that of wage laborers. The workingmen of America have not had this hereditary condition of slavery and serfdom. There has been no special status for them as slaves or serfs, and in theory, at least, they were supposed to be equals to all others.

Another reason is the climatic conditions that obtain in our country. The changes from extreme heat to extreme cold make the people more active, more nervous; accelerate their motion, accelerate their thought; again, the vast domain of land, rich soil, that even to-day is beyond speculation, much less the knowledge

of our own people—all these things have contributed to a better material condition for the working people of our country. I should add, I think, that the climate conditions, requiring better food, more nutritious food, better clothing, more comfortable clothing, better houses, better homes, have all been contributing factors for the workers to insist upon receiving—to secure these things in the shape of higher wages. . . .

[I take it that you do not believe that the rich are getting richer in this country and the poor constantly getting poorer?] I do not believe that the poor are getting poorer; those who are rich are becoming richer. . . . It seems to have become a catch phrase, but I do not think that they necessarily go together. There is a greater productivity in the world to-day, and the wage-earners are getting a larger share of the product of labor. They are not getting the share which, in my judgment, they are entitled to by any means. . . .

Every step that the workers take, every vantage point gained, is a solution in itself. . . . I maintain that we are solving the problems every day, as they confront us. One would imagine by what is often considered as the solution of the problem that a world cataclysm is going to take place; that we shall go to bed one night under the present system and the morrow morning wake up with a revolution in full blast, and the next day organize a Heaven on earth. That is not the way that progress is made; that is not the way the social evolution is brought about; that is not the way the interests of the human family are advanced. We are solving the problem day after day. As we get an hour's more leisure every day it means millions of golden hours, of opportunities, to the human family. As we get 25 cents a day wages increase it means another solution, another problem solved, and brings us nearer the time when a greater degree of justice and fair dealing will obtain among men.—*From testimony before United States Industrial Commission, April 18, 1899.*

Through the efforts of the American Federation of Labor, involuntary servitude in Hawaii, enforceable by law, was abolished by Congress. The bill providing a code for the government of, and perpetuating slavery or involuntary servitude in, the Territory of Hawaii, was introduced and passed by the House of Rep-

resentatives. The bill contained the perpetuation of slavery or involuntary servitude and was reported favorably by the Senate committee, and would undoubtedly have passed and been enacted, had it not been for the activity of the representatives of our Federation, who secured the following amendments to the code:

"That no suit or proceeding shall be maintained for the specific performance of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into, for personal labor or service; nor shall any remedy exist or be enforced for breach of any such contract, except in a civil suit or proceeding instituted solely to recover damages for such breach."

We love to speak of the good old times when men acted as individuals, when workmen had no unions and we had in our country no strikes. First, I want to disabuse the mind of any one who may entertain that notion that the so-called good old times are worth again ushering in. I have lived somewhat in the so-called good old times.

I have no desire to see a re-introduction of them. With all the faults of our present time, I believe that it is the best that has ever existed on this mundane sphere. With us, I take it, as with you, with all the improvement that has come, it is not half good enough as compared with what we believe it ought to be. But, take the notion of some of our friends who speak rather in imagination of the so-called good old times when there were no unions of labor and each man, as they say, stood upon his own feet, independent, and was a man and a sovereign. . . .

Organized labor found a condition of affairs in industry, when the first efforts of organization made their advent, that appalls the student. When organized labor made its advent upon the field of industry it found the children in the mills and in the mines, in the shops and in the factories, and it is due to the much-abused organizations of labor that we find upon the statute books of our most enlightened states and countries the laws protecting the lives of the young and the innocent children, who through our efforts have been put into the school rooms and into the playgrounds rather than in the factories and the workshops.

When organized labor came upon the field the suffocation of men in the mines was of common occurrence, the caving in of mines was of such frequency that no one seemed to pay atten-

tion, and regarded it either as an act of Divine Providence or at least of accidental character for which no one was to blame. The proper ventilation of mines, the safeguarding of machinery, the child-labor laws upon our statute books have come as a result of this movement.—*From address at Buffalo, N. Y., before the Independent Club, January 8, 1903.*

Doesn't it lurk in the minds of all of us—millionaire or wage-worker—that there is a good time coming and that we are all hoping for it and striving for it in our own way? Some men think that it is coming in 10 years, others in 50, others in 100, some in 1,000, and still others in a longer period, but every man has it in his mind that there is a better day coming. How do you hope to bring it about, then, if that be so, without the aid of the masses of the people in their organization, who shall help to make of this country the great workshop of the world, who shall make of this country the great star of hope of the world, that has not only given the Declaration of Independence to the world, a new charter and a new birthright, but that shall make these declarations the living principles of our every-day lives, and without friction, without fight, without contest, each trying to vie with the other to do his level best in order that we may progress industrially, commercially, politically, morally, working out the great future which in my opinion the American people are destined to achieve.—*From address at Jamestown, N. Y., January 29, 1903.*

Miss Addams expresses the fear that the idealism of the unions is incompatible with, and endangered by, the necessity of "practical and business-like" methods. Employers complain that workmen are unreasonable and under the dominion of sentiment and dogma, and the question put by Miss Addams is whether in adopting business principles the unions are not sacrificing, and necessarily, their early idealism.

We do not think that this must follow. To make contracts and stick to them, even when they limit or take away the right of striking out of sympathy, is not to sacrifice idealism. To consult actual conditions and the dictates of reasonable expediency before striking or making demands upon employers is not to abandon any ideal ever proposed by intelligent unionists.

The "idealism" of the labor movement consists primarily in this, that the organized workmen in striking to better their own condition and to secure for themselves more equitable treatment are really battling for social and industrial progress.

When the workers raise the standard of living they raise it for all.

When the unions reduce the hours of toil or increase pay, they accomplish these beneficial results, not for any class, but for all classes.

The strike-breaker, the "scab," the man who is too ignorant or too servile, or too selfish to join a union, reaps the benefit of an organization he does his worst to undermine.

Society needs justice, a fairer system of distribution, greater opportunity, freedom and leisure for its workers.

The unions are doing the work of society; in Miss Addams' words they are intrusted with the task of social amelioration. Their methods must be governed by circumstances, but no method which really promotes the welfare of union labor can possibly injure any other class.—*American Federationist, October, 1904.*

The improvement in the condition of the working people of our country is not the result of any kindly philanthropy, not a matter of sympathy. The improvement is due entirely to the united associated efforts of the working people themselves.—*From address at Dayton, Ohio, May 19, 1905.*

Two influences have been operating to develop sentiment in favor of establishing, in private industry, legislative regulation of contractual relations; one, an ardent enthusiasm to accomplish big results by one revolutionizing regulation, the other a sort of moral flabbiness that refuses to assume responsibility for its own life but endeavors to cast upon society not only all responsibility for the environment in which people live and work, but also responsibility for securing for them conditions that are desirable and helpful.

The latter is a repudiation of the characteristics that enabled Americans to get results. They never feared the hard places but dared to wrestle with a primeval country. They were red-blooded men and women with ruggedness in their wills. They were ready

to fight for right and justice and equality, ready to defend what was rightfully theirs. This is the spirit that has made the American labor movement the most aggressive labor organization in the world, and has made its members the most efficient workers to be found anywhere. The American labor movement has done things for the workers despite hostility of employers and indifference of society.

Then as to the other influence—the desire to secure the big thing at one "fell swoop." That has appealed to the imagination of dreamers and those who are infected with intellectual phantasmagoria.

They forget that after all permanent changes and progress must come from within man. You can't "save" people—they must save themselves. Unless the working people are organized to express their desires and needs and organized to express their will, any other method tends to weaken initiative.

And this is not a narrow policy, unmindful of the difficulties and hardships that encompass overworked, exploited workers. The organized labor movement has done much for the unorganized; in incalculable ways the unorganized have been the beneficiaries of the fights and struggles of the organized.—*From pamphlet "The Workers and The Eight-Hour Work-day," 1915.*

I said a while ago that we were primarily interested as union men in our own members. That is true. We would not be human were we otherwise. But the men of labor would not give their time and their lives to the agitation of, and to the education of this great labor movement, if its influences were confined to its members alone.

The labor organizations can not do an act of any sort but it will have its influence, not only upon the members of the trade or calling directly involved, but in the entire ramifications of society. If the labor organization shall succeed in preventing a reduction in wages, don't you see that that very fact will check a reduction in wages of the non-union men as well? Don't you see, that when the organizations of labor secure an increase in wages, why they practically lift up the condition of the non-union workers? Don't you know that when the hours of labor of the union members are shortened, it shortens the hours of the non-union men? This great agitation for more time, for more

leisure, for more opportunity, for the establishment of a universal eight hour workday—it has had its influence not only upon union and non-union workingmen, but it has its influence in every ramification of society.

And so, my friends, let me say, that though our labor movement to-day seems to be placed in the position that we are fighting for the liberties of the union men, that is but a superficial view of it. We are fighting for the liberties of all our people, not only to-day, but for all time.

During the middle ages the nobles were wise enough to nurse the power which was exercised and inherent in the free cities. I take it, my friends, that it would be the part of wisdom that if those who loved liberty most and who stood for the principles upon which the republic of our country is based, would realize that in the labor movement of our time is vested the power and the spirit to defend justice and to perpetuate free institutions. If they do not possess that understanding, if they do not realize that fact, then to the workmen alone, and upon their shoulders alone, falls the duty and responsibility of standing for the principles for which the labor movement stands to-day, and which involves the very essentials of free institutions.—*From address at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1908.*

We assume, and of just right proclaim, that the physical constitution of the American Republic and its political institutions are rapidly forming the foundation of the world's social, moral, and spiritual regeneration. . . . We are standing at the meeting and parting of ways. We are preparing to take hold upon a new form of national life. We are to leave the old ways, taking with us a glorious and profitable experience. We are to set our faces toward the oncoming prodigious development of our country. Population is increasing enormously. Commercial centers are taxing their energies to provide for the handling of our manufactured and raw materials, of our crops, and the housing, feeding, schooling, and general livelihood of their constantly growing populations. Millions of acres of virgin soil are being prepared by irrigation for the farmer and the husbandman. The great watersheds of the country are more and more forcing themselves upon the attention of wise and thoughtful conservators of the nation's future; inland waterways; great canals and navi-

gable streams whereon to float the commerce of the future; the development of forestry as an art, and the seeding, planting, and the cultivation of young trees; the appointment and maintenance of national commissions to look after these great projects; the prospective establishment of a Department of Labor with a secretary in the President's cabinet—all these things loom up on the horizon of this new day or era in the progress and development of the American Republic.—*American Federationist, July, 1908.*

In no European country are our common schools equaled in their opportunities for education, in their inexpensiveness to the scholars, in their quality as a nursery of wholesome, manly and womanly sentiment. Comparing the railway systems of Europe with those of America, the traveler is obliged to look downward and backward, for in that respect Europe is half a century behind. The product of the American printing press, taken in its widest scope, its magazines, its newspapers, is a marvel to Europeans in quality of output and cheapness of price as well as richness in interest to all members of society.—*From address in New York City, October, 1909.*

There are men prominent in the industrial and political affairs of our country who do not or will not understand the present trend of economic and social development, nor the position which the organized labor movement takes relative thereto, expressing as it does an orderly and rational progress, and they consequently set themselves against the projects and aspirations of the toilers. They will, as a matter of grace, yield a crumb of materiality, yet deny to the toilers the fundamental principle of freedom—freedom to exercise those personal activities necessary in the struggle to work out their own amelioration and emancipation. It is most unfortunate that opponents assume such an attitude of hostility to the growth of the much misunderstood and misrepresented labor movement of our country and our time, and endeavor to circumscribe its activities within such limitations as would deprive its members of their inherent, natural, and constitutional rights.

For what does organized labor contend if not to improve the standard of life, to uproot ignorance and foster education, to

instill character and manhood and an independent spirit among our people, to bring about a recognition of the interdependence in modern life of man, and his fellow-man? We aim to establish a normal workday, to take the children from the factory and the workshop and give them the opportunity of the school, the home, and the playground. In a word, the unions of labor, recognizing the duty to toil, strive to educate their members, to make their homes and lives more cheerful in every way, to contribute an earnest effort toward making life the better worth living, to avail their members of their rights as citizens and to bear the duties and responsibilities and perform the obligations they owe to our country and to our fellow-men.

In the constant struggle, in the struggle of the ages, as well as of our time, the self-same elements of bitter antagonism have been and are now encountered. Labor contends that in every effort to achieve its praiseworthy ends all honorable and lawful means are not only commendable but should receive the sympathetic support of every right-thinking, progressive man. The wheels of industry must not be turned back nor the movements of commerce halted. The industrial and commercial development can not and must not be checked.

Concentration of wealth continues. The tools of labor have been alienated from the toilers. Vast and intricate machinery has supplanted them. The toilers must work. Their economic position in society is changed. They can no longer act as individuals to redress a wrong or to attain a right. They must pool their individual effort for their associated protection and weal, and if the concept of the sovereignty of citizenship is not a meaningless phrase the toilers must in their common effort under modern industrial conditions be accorded the exercise of their rights as citizens, as men, and as workers, to protect themselves from the tyranny which concentrated wealth and industry impose if left unchecked, and wherever necessary to contend against that tyranny and to work for a higher and better opportunity to live and to progress. Judicial decisions and legislative enactments are to be expected in the course of the evolution through which we are passing, but whatever their character the workers in our Republic must be accorded at least the same rights as those enjoyed by the subjects of the monarchy of Great Britain and of nearly every other civilized country.

Because the labor movement in our country is so thoroughly imbued with the consciousness and the responsibility to rationally, naturally, and in an orderly manner work out the great problems of the relations of the workers to society and to the evolution of industry and commerce, and particularly with the necessity to work for a higher and better life for the workers and for common humanity, I regard the attitude of such hostility as I have recalled from men prominent in political and industrial affairs as not only unjustified, but highly prejudicial to the best interest of all our people and particularly dangerous to an orderly adjustment and solution of the economic problems and social difficulties of our time.

In all countries of the civilized world the economic problem is up for discussion, and its solution, gradual, peaceful, or otherwise, is a question of imminent importance. What in many other countries is sought or accomplished by force or the show of force is in our movement undertaken or achieved by the American methods of agitation, education, and organization, and the exercise of the personal rights of man in association with his fellows —rights which must not under any pretense be denied by the subterfuge of injunctions or outlawed by the perversion or interpretation of law.

If the labor movement of America can be outlawed and its normal endeavors in the interests of the toilers and all the deprived stratum of humanity made impossible, the discontent of our people with existing wrongs and their efforts for relief will find their expression in another form, a form perhaps not quite so rational or orderly. On another occasion I have expressed this thought, whereupon malicious opponents have perverted it to make it appear the utterance of a threat. It is not a threat; it is a diagnosis of societary conditions; it is a prediction—a prediction based upon a knowledge of the struggles of the peoples in the past and an understanding of human nature.

The toilers must, for their own safety now and for the future, organize. Their organizations must be accorded the full legal status recognized in all voluntary associations dealing with purely personal affairs and instituted not for profit. In the same degree that these rights are recognized and conceded by present irrational opponents, will the great economic and industrial problems of our time and of the future be rationally, safely, and

peacefully solved. Solved they must be at all hazards.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, St. Louis, Mo., November, 1910.*

So we feel cheered on this Labor Day. We even feel like laying aside the hardness that is acquired in the course of many battles against big odds and allowing the sentimental side of our natures to show themselves. We feel like talking of our women and children and the battle organized labor is waging to make them comfortable at their work and healthy in their homes. We want to cite the human suffering that the organized workers have been able to abolish and to pledge ourselves anew to a continued battle to bring decent working hours and conditions into these dark places of the nation that are still its most crying disgrace. And withal we are sanguine of a day that is coming when all working people may perform their tasks with the satisfaction that a happier life is possible to them. The progress has been such that there is occasion for hopefulness.—*From Labor Day statement, 1911.*

Labor's contentions of many years have at length become merged into, or have rather coördinated with, those of the progressive of all parties. The people as a whole, irrespective of class, condition, calling or partisan alignment, have declared for freedom in fact, and not merely in name. They are taking affairs political into their own hands. They will no longer tolerate the sale of legislation to the highest bidder or the granting of franchises to the richest bribe-giver. Under the coming régime, assuredly there are to be no more court decrees entered as prepared in advance and ordered by the attorney for the stronger party—stronger politically or financially. Along with these abuses will depart the midnight injunction and the policeman's ready club, at the behest of those claiming a property right in the labor of the vicinage, whether at work or on strike. In lieu of the political boss and his machine, we shall have leadership of intelligence, pleading for public justice, with adherents proportioned in number to the strength of the arguments. The stuffed ballot-box, the false count, and the perjured election return will likewise disappear. With these opportunities, with these stimulating inducements to free thought and action, the cause of

public justice will be advanced in all directions. Labor, acting from the point of enlightened self-interest, and yet with a full sense of responsibility respecting the just rights of all others in society, will manfully and patriotically meet its enlarged responsibilities.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlanta, Ga., Novmber, 1911.*

With the progress of the ages has come a widening of men's thoughts and social vision, a new appreciation of the meaning of life with its attendant responsibilities and obligations. Among men and women of all walks of life has come this awakening; all manner of social solutions are urged; all kinds of associations for the promotion of special reforms have arisen. The accumulated momentum of all these activities has swept away the mental atmosphere generated by the old individualistic philosophy, made way for broader, more generous sympathies and impulses, and enlightened, scientific efforts to achieve the highest development industrially, politically, socially, and morally. In starting the forces that have led to these changes, our much misrepresented organized labor movement has wielded an influence previously little understood outside our ranks. As is just, we profit also by the changes we have created, for this wider social vision has enabled men to see the justice of our work and of our fundamental principles and purposes. To-day we find innumerable organizations working independently, or willing to coöperate with us, to the end that workers shall be enabled to have better working conditions, a shorter working day and better wages, that our life may be wholesome, clean, and uplifting. All of these things are stepping-stones by which the toilers climb upward and onward—each step revealing a wider horizon and an increasing conception of human possibilities. . . .

Contemplation of the progress of labor reveals the journey upward through the centuries from the status of slavery to serfdom to villenage, and finally to freedom, opening the road to a new plane of battle—legal, individual freedom did not as such secure industrial and social freedom. The struggle to secure for the individual, opportunity for development of mental, physical, and moral powers that he might enter into his rightful heritage, joy in life and work, began with juristic freedom and is the inspiration of our present activities. To show what progress we

have made, one has only to turn the pages of history. The organized workman of to-day enjoys comforts of which feudal barons never dreamed—comforts of home, heating, furnishing, sanitation, food, and clothing; his children receive in the public schools an education more comprehensive than medieval universities could bestow; his opportunities for intellectual stimulation and social amusement have increased a thousandfold; his advantages in transportation and communication have revolutionized living. These same pages of history tell the story of how those who labor have been able to secure so much greater proportion of the social wealth. Wherever the working people have made progress, some form of organization has been the agency that has transformed individual impotency into collective strength —fraternities, lodges, merchant guilds, craft guilds have been helpful, but the labor unions, trade unions, have been the most potent factors in the forward movement. A survey of methods shows that the forms of "labor war" have been constantly refined; free workmen do not employ the methods of revolting slaves. As the workers' organizations were strengthened, more benefits were secured; as a result of these benefits, the workers developed physically and mentally and were able to produce more wealth; with a broader outlook and increased self-appreciation, new demands were formulated—so the cycle of progress continues. This dynamic examination presents achievements of which we are justly proud, affords encouragement for continuation of the struggle. The backsets have been temporary; what seemed at the time disasters, the historic perspective reveals as incentives to new methods and activities; increased well-being has been permanent. . . .

This more efficient, more human worker, demands better working conditions, the aim being to conserve human resources. Much has been done to let pure air and sunshine into working places, to exclude conditions breeding organisms injurious to life, but ever-increasing knowledge and the widening of our conception forbid us to stop or stay in the crusade for human welfare. Among all the organizations on the American continent working upon the various phases of this great problem, the American Federation of Labor is the leader, and has often been the pioneer blazing the way. . . .

As a result of the recent awakening of the workers of the

United States, this growing realization of their political power and influence, more progress in remedial, constructive legislation has been made this year than in the decade previous. We do need new devices and new methods of political expression, but not half as much as we need to realize and to use the power that we now possess, to consecrate ourselves and our ability to humanity's cause.

As labor organizations have been able to secure advantages for their members, they have endeavored as far as possible to share these with the workmen not enrolled in their ranks. We have endeavored to help them to help themselves, to organize, federate, and educate their fellow-workers so that we shall hasten the time when poverty with its fear and degradation shall be eliminated, and the way opened for lasting progress. Rights and privileges that are to-day entrusted to our care, are the fruits of past struggles. We are obligated to preserve inviolate the things entrusted to our keeping, and to account for them with interest to the next age.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Rochester, N. Y., November, 1912.*

"The old idea was that there were three professions—doctor, minister, lawyer—but that idea has passed. Conscientious ditch-digging is as much a profession as any," so spoke Vice-President Marshall who refuses to be condemned to the conventional four years of silence. And he rightly interpreted changing opinion which no longer sharply distinguishes between business and professions and trades. After all it is not so much the nature of the work done that lifts it above mere drudgery and transforms it into a calling as it is the attitude of the worker toward his work. There is a marked tendency in the educational and industrial world to foster a spirit and an understanding that shall give each confidence and professional pride in his particular job whether it be grinding teeth or pins, collecting tickets or bond coupons, painting houses or pictures.

The ideal of modern education is to develop individual efficiency that shall enable the worker to take creative satisfaction in good work, done with an understanding of its relation to social needs. This ideal is shaping the policies of the public schools and the universities. Our oldest university, Harvard, has recently added a new school, that of Business Administration, and

will credit its courses equally with those of the long-recognized Schools of Art, Law, Science, etc. This is not a new idea, for similar schools have been established by many colleges and universities, but it indicates increasing spread of true democracy. It might be said that business is being professionalized or that all professions are becoming business—both equally true. At any rate, we are reaching the conviction that there's no job so lowly but what is worth doing for the work's sake, if it serves a real need—and the worker should be respected accordingly, duly compensated that he may have joy and self-respect in his calling. Idealism? Surely, but it is a good thing to infuse idealism into every job. Idealism is necessary to every work and movement—it helps to keep the purpose true and steady and honest. . . .

Idealism preserves faith in mankind and confidence in the effectiveness of purposeful work. So the idealism of the trade union movement has shaped its policies, has given breadth and depth to its influence, and has brought a freer life and hope to many.—*American Federationist, July, 1913.*

Labor is not only in sympathy with but will support all movements for the conservation and betterment of humanity. In fact, a compelling sense of responsibility for human conservation and the desire to protect individual interests are among the causes for organization among the workers. In labor's economic platform are demands for a shorter working day and a living wage—two conditions absolutely essential to physical well-being. Organized labor insists upon safety, sanitation, compulsory education, and many practical educational developments and advantages which aid the individual to reach the fullest development. We would have the children develop sound bodies and strong, healthy minds, would fit them for productive living, and would enable them to do the best work of which they are capable and then assure to them a just compensation.—*American Federationist, October, 1913.*

On June 25, 1868, Congress enacted an eight-hour law. On May 19, 1869, President Grant issued a proclamation forbidding a reduction in wages on account of any reduction of the hours of labor. On May 11, 1872, President Grant issued a proclamation calling attention to what were presented to him as violations

of the eight-hour act, and issued a direction to the departments of the Government to make no reduction in the wages paid by the Government by the day for laborers, workingmen, and mechanics, on account of the reduction in the hours of labor. On May 18, 1872, Congress enacted a law providing that the proper accounting officers be directed, authorized, and required to settle accounts for the services of workers who had been required to work more than eight hours a day. On March 30, 1888, in the urgent deficiency bill, the Public Printer was directed to enforce the provisions of the eight-hour law in the department under his charge.

On May 24, 1888, the eight-hour law was extended to apply to the letter carriers. On August 1, 1892, a further law was adopted applying not only to the Government employees, but to mechanics and artisans employed by any contractor or subcontractor, and then followed the interpretations of that law to which I have already called attention. Then followed the amendments to that law which we sought, and finally, on June 8, 1912, the law was amended in order to forbid the employment of men beyond the eight-hour limit, unless there was a great emergency as provided by the law. I may say that President Taft presented me with the pen with which he signed that law.—*From abstract of testimony before House Lobby Investigation Committee, Washington, D. C., December, 1913.*

The trade unions of America reached their highest development during the year 1913. They made themselves felt in city councils, county boards, county court-houses, state legislatures, state courts, the national Congress, the federal courts, and in every sphere where human activity and human betterment can be obtained for the workers through legislative or judicial means, but they used those great agencies as supplemental agencies in the wonderful work they have accomplished themselves through their economic organization—the trade unions. They have made their influence felt among school boards, colleges and state universities, in behalf of a higher, better, more practical, more useful, system of education, because the workers realize that the greatest foe which labor has is ignorance, and that the only way to uproot ignorance is to procure more knowledge, not knowledge of a superficial character, but knowledge of the power of men work-

ing in associated effort with the determination to do the greatest good to the greatest number.—*From report to International Federation of Trade Unions, 1914.*

No man can carry on a great industry alone. No great fortune has been amassed through the efforts of one individual. The combined minds of all associated together in the industry, their labor power, their coöperation and service are necessary to the success of the undertaking. Is there a man so impervious to the molding forces of the world in which he lives as to point to any one thing and say, "I, alone, did that?" Each of us is the heir of all the ages—none of us lives, acts, or thinks by himself alone. To ignore reality and to force upon the toilers a concept of individual isolation is to attempt to erect an opposition impervious to the meaning of natural forces and conditions that can only dam them back until the accumulated force sweeps aside everything.—*American Federationist, May, 1914.*

Nor do I believe, from my common observation of the plasterers of America, or of the working people of America, that the conditions of the plasterers or the working people generally are worse to-day than they have ever been in the past. I glance around me here and I look into the faces of plasterers. I go through the country and see plasterers at work, as well as plasterers in conference and in meetings, and I have visited plasterers and other workers in their homes, and I know that both in physical development, and in mental attainment, and in their home life, as regards their homes and surroundings, and the opportunities given their children to go to the schools, they are far in advance of the time when you and I, at their age, were at the factories, in the work-shops, in the mills and in the mines. In every respect have the conditions of the working people, and the plasterers having kept pace with them, materially improved, both as to development and physical betterment.—*From address at Operative Plasterers' Convention, Washington, D. C., September 28, 1914.*

On March 4, 1915, President Wilson signed the seamen's bill —an act to promote the welfare of American seamen, to promote safety at sea, and to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a pen-

alty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto.

This is a law of international significance. It makes the soil of America sacred land upon which no bondman may set foot without losing his fetters.

The seamen's legislation not only frees American seamen on American soil but in all of the ports of the world, and bestows the same freedom upon the seamen of every vessel coming into American ports. The law abolishes the imprisonment penalty that previously could be imposed upon any seaman for quitting work on his vessel in a foreign port, and releases American consuls from their obligations to act as "slave catchers" for American ships in foreign ports. All parts of treaties which provide for the arrest and imprisonment of sailors and officers quitting foreign merchant vessels in American ports are abolished.

The legislation provides for the regulation of hours of work and of the payment, allotment and attachment of wages. It establishes better and specific standards regulating the living quarters of the sailors and the provisions for their personal comfort and welfare. It requires better provisions for the safety of all on board the vessel. Under the new legislation seamen have the right to demand an inspection of the vessel to test its seaworthiness.

But the important change that has a revolutionary possibility is the section concerned with the qualifications of the sailors who man the vessels. The qualifications for able seamen demand that those into whose hands is placed the safety of the human lives on the vessel, shall have skill, efficiency, resourcefulness. These are qualities of free men. This part of the law means that Americans will return to service on the sea, a service in which they earned great fame, and will again. Freedom, better conditions, possibilities for increased betterment will establish American standards necessary for American seamen. The seamen's law, known for years as Andrew Furuseth's bill, is one of the great acts of legislation. It makes sacred those human rights which are the very heart of human freedom.

The American Federation of Labor very materially and effectively aided in the years of effort to secure the enactment of the seamen's bill; its officers contributed their fullest support. In the Bill of Grievances formulated by the great conference of the

officers of international unions in Washington, 1906, the demand for the seamen's bill was given a conspicuous place. But all said and done it is only a just appreciation to say that to Andrew Furuseth is due the honor and the glory not only for the great triumph, but for the terrific contest. And what a contest it was is scarcely in the power of any one to tell.

The Seamen's Act has a rightful place among those really important American legislative acts that have dedicated our soil to freedom. It belongs with the emancipation proclamation of Lincoln and the legislative declaration of Congress, "That the labor power of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce."—*American Federationist, April, 1915.*

Every real advance in human freedom is a tremendous event in history. For this reason, we proclaim as one of the great legislative declarations of all the ages this sentence in the Clayton Anti-trust Act: The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce.

The far-reaching revolutionary significance of that declaration is not fully grasped by all. It sweeps away legal precedents and legal philosophy that have served to impede labor's efforts to rid itself of all vestiges of the conditions and relations that existed when human workers were born slaves and held as slaves. It demolishes that structure of economic theory that had been built up upon the concept that human power to produce is a commodity to be bought, owned and controlled by employers.

The principle embodied in this legislative declaration will humanize legal and economic theories.—*American Federationist, September, 1915.*

Leisure instills the desire to travel, to see other parts. Leisure cultivates tastes for art, music, the concert, operas, the theater. But the new opportunities availed of in any channel are no longer luxuries. The luxuries of the past have become the necessities of to-day, and all mankind agrees that in order that the workers may be counted upon to continue their labor, the necessities of life must be assured them. It follows, therefore, that to make the luxuries of to-day the necessities of life for the morrow—to continually raise the standard of life of the workers—is in the highest degree sound economy; moral, social, and

material progress in the interests of the workers is progress in the interests of all.—*From article prepared for Bureau of Labor Statistics of Michigan, 1896.*

Out in the world of labor and life the workers have put a real meaning into the phrase, "The Dignity of Labor." That reality has been created out of the power of the bones and sinews and the brains of those who work for wages and has been given concrete form in our material civilization. They have given not only their working power, but they have broken their bones, mangled their flesh, spilled their blood, and have expended the best in life and spirit on the work of the world. It has given the dignity of labor a deeper and more permanent expression in the ideals of humanity, justice and freedom, that the workers have been made a part of the guiding and directing forces of our nation. Every day's work has been a demonstration that the workers can and do do things. They supply the creative power that is a necessary part of the processes of material production. The work of their hands and brain is everywhere—buildings of industry and railroads that unite the distant parts of our country, the material agencies of transportation and communication, articles of daily food, use and wear, and in all of that which pertains to the material agencies of life and work. They have contributed something more than mechanical producing power. It is the mind and the insight controlling the muscles of the workers that give them value as producers and as members of society. . . .

The basis for representation and participation in the affairs of organized society is man, not property. The purpose of social organization is the furtherance of human rights, interests, justice and liberty—it seeks to achieve a beautiful ideal—the fullness of life and opportunity for all. The workers, the masses of the people, therefore have a right to participate, and will insist upon this participation in the determination and control of all that concerns their lives and the lives of the generations yet to come.—*American Federationist, February, 1916.*

In the last twelve years the conditions of the working people in the matter of wages, hours, conditions of employment, safety while at work—in fact, all conditions that make for a better life

—have improved more than they have during any other period or among any other people in the history of the world. I say this despite the spirit of disappointment I feel because of the seemingly slow progress made. There is just resentment against conditions that deny to the workers the best possible opportunities of work and life, and out of that spirit of resentment there is a movement of men and women who are pressing home upon employers and society the greater rights and the greater opportunities to which the toilers of America are entitled. But because of this impatient and resentful spirit of trades unionists, I can not permit to go unchallenged the attempt that has been made in the name of the Socialist party of America to aim a death blow at the trades union movement. . . .

The truth is that due to present abnormal conditions prices have risen, and are now abnormally high. You can not use this last year as a criterion, because everything has been disarranged; the international commerce of the world has been disarranged and disorganized. At this moment comparisons are not fair either to one side or the other of any controversy. Disregarding this period of disorganization, the prices of the essentials have gone downward since 1870. The fact of the matter is that we have so far enlarged our conception of what we call the necessaries of life during the past thirty years that there is no way to compare the standard of life of the worker of the past with the life of the worker to-day. Hours of labor have been shortened, working conditions have been improved, and there is a growing tendency towards safety and sanitation. The increase in wages alone has been of tremendous importance. . . .

In 1888 the average length of lives of the members [of the Cigarmakers' International Union of America] was 31 years, 4 months and 20 days.

In 1890 the total age of 212 deceased members was reported as 7,943 years, making an average of 37 years and 6 months at time of death.

In 1900 the total age of 339 deceased members was reported as 14,762 years, making an average of 43 years and 6 months at time of death.

In 1910 the total age of 588 deceased members was reported as 29,362 years, making an average of 49 years and 10 months at time of death.

In 1911 the total age of 622 deceased members was reported as 31,209 years, making an average of 50 years and 1 month at time of death.

This shows an increase in the average length of the lives of members of 18 years, 8 months and 10 days since 1888, or a period of 23 years.

In 1890 the average age of the members' wives and mothers who died was 38 years.

In 1911 the average age of the members' wives and mothers who died was 48 years.

This shows an increase of 10 years in the length of lives of the wives and mothers of the members in a period of 21 years.

I have not had an opportunity to ascertain accurate figures and data of the other organizations, the other international and national unions of America, but I say this to you, gentlemen, with a knowledge of the responsibility that is carried with the statement, that the other organizations of labor, the other trade unions, can show as good, or nearly as good, and in some instances better results than I have quoted.—*From testimony before Congressional Committee, April 11, 1916, on resolution for a Commission on Social Insurance.*

If those of you who are of mature years will bring your minds back, and, if you of more recent times, who may have read or heard of conditions prevailing in the olden time, will imagine the contrast when the doors of men and women in decent homes were closed in the faces of the men who dared preach the gospel of the rights of labor, and contrast that situation with now, this glorious era in which we live, when at the dedication of this magnificent structure erected for service in the cause of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity, we find the President of this great Republic of ours adorning this occasion, with not only his presence, but the presence of members of his Cabinet, you will find a marvelous change. From the time of slavery, when all the workers, not only the blacks but the whites were slaves, when the owner, the master, was lord of all, when there were none to say to him nay against his overlordship over those men and women workers whom he owned, from the time of serfdom to our institutions of industry of to-day, there has been a growth that dazzles the mind. This is a wonderful age in which we are privileged to

live. There has been running through the course of history the struggle of the masses of the people, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. Wherever injustice and tyranny were exercised, it was the masses, it was the people, the workers, who suffered. It was and is the mission of the masses of the people, it is the mission of the workers of our time, it is the mission of the much misunderstood and misrepresented organized labor movement, to carry on the work to its fulfillment so that the wonderful sentiment and view and rights declared in our Declaration of Independence, that man is endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, shall not only be a declaration that was given to the world but shall establish a new status and a new concept of new rights of man.

That declaration gave to us this Republic of ours with all its opportunities and it is the purpose of the organized labor movement of America to make these declarations a charter of human rights, the living actual rules of our every-day life. Men are not necessarily free because declarations of independence so declare. Men are not necessarily free because the Constitution guarantees freedom. Men are given the opportunities for freedom and they must, if they aim to be free, exercise the activities that come with intelligent free men.—*From address at dedication of American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C., July 4, 1916.*

The achievements of these thirty-six years of growth and activity are typified in the Labor Temple that was dedicated on Independence Day. The achievement of this purpose demonstrates that the labor movement is now a potential factor in national life and has earned a place of responsibility and honorable recognition. Whatever of achievement and recognition has come to the organized labor movement is the result of persistence and well-directed struggle against untold opposition. It speaks something for what has been accomplished that the President of the United States accepted the invitation to deliver the chief address made at the dedication of Labor's Temple. Nor was the President alone in his desire to express his appreciation of the significance and the importance of the labor movement. There were present also the Vice-President of the United States,

members of the President's Cabinet, members of the United States Congress and other governmental officials.—*American Federationist, August, 1916.*

We are all here in this great melting pot of America. There is none of us who is going back to the old country to stay there. Our children are here. All our hope for the future is here. Our sacred dead are here. The people of these United States are confronted with the great problem of self-government, not a government which can be overturned in the night and created anew in the morning. We do not and cannot have progressive, humanitarian, liberty-protecting government when government can be overturned in the twinkling of an eye or the turning of a hand. We want a government flexible, capable of improvement as our conscience and our intelligence quicken, as our understanding broadens and our hearts are touched with humanitarian impulses, with the understanding and the desire to do the right, to help bear our brothers' burdens, to recognize that the meanest among us is entitled to the consideration and the protection of the strong, to do all that man can do for his fellows, to be willing to bear the burden and the responsibilities which are entailed in the doing of the right.—*From address accepting the presidency of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, Minneapolis, Minn., September 7, 1917.*

VII

ORGANIZED LABOR'S CHALLENGE TO SOCIALISM AND REVOLUTION

SOCIALISM AND SOCIALIST TACTICS

There are men—not so numerous now as they have been in the past—who are endeavoring to conquer the trades-union movement and subordinate it to those doctrines [socialism and communism] and in a measure, in a few organizations, that condition of things exists, but by no means does it exist in the largest, most powerful and best organized trade unions. There the view of which I spoke just now, the desire to improve the condition of the workingmen by and through the efforts of the trades union, is fully lived up to. . . . The endeavors of which I have spoken, made by certain persons to conquer the trades unions in certain cases, are resisted by the trades unionists. . . . I believe that the existence of the trades-union movement, more especially where the unionists are better organized, has evoked a spirit and a demand for reform, but has held in check the more radical elements in society.—*From testimony before United States Senate committee upon the Relations between Capital and Labor (Henry W. Blair, chairman), August 18, 1883.*

Perhaps of all the enemies with whom the trade unions have to contend there is no one more dangerous, and often villainous, than he who under the mask of sympathy with the toiler's struggle for justice sets forth a patent scheme and nostrum for the immediate and absolute remedy of all the ills to which the workers are heir.

The fact that the workers organize in unions and secure wages, advantages and conditions of employment, which, without organization, would never be conceded, is nothing to these economic soothsayers and political healers.

Should the trade union succeed in winning a strike and securing better conditions, the result is decried and the argument set forth that this is deplorable, since, in their own vernacular, "it makes the working people contented with the present order of society and Government," hence is a hindrance to the full comprehension and introduction of their pet theory. On the other hand, should the men lose a strike, it is immediately harped upon in a frantic effort to prove that the trade union is "old, effete and impotent."

The fact that in spite of the tremendous development of industry within the last few decades, the stupendous and marvelous discoveries and inventions of new forces and their application to the industry and commerce of the country, the workers have not only forced concessions from the employing classes, which have enhanced their condition materially, morally and socially, but more than that, gave the workers the great lesson of the power of organization, the self-sacrifice necessary at times to achieve success, the mutual inter-dependence of workers in order to attain their rights and establish a sympathy and recognition of their identity of interests—all these count as nothing with the economic quack.—*American Federationist, April, 1896.*

Our friends, the socialists, always when with us have an excellent conception of the trouble in our industrial life. They say, as we say, and as every intelligent man or woman says, that there are miseries which surround us. We recognize the poverty, we know the sweatshop, we can play on every string of the harp, and touch the tenderest chords of human sympathy; but while we recognize the evil and would apply the remedy, our socialist friends would look forward to the promised land, and wait for "the sweet by and by." Their statements as to economic ills are right, their conclusions and their philosophy are all askew. . . .

There has not been a legislative body before which the other officers of the Federation or I myself have appeared, nor an association of employers, nor individual employers with whom we have met in conference but that we have been confronted with this socialistic amendment, so called, which came near being passed at New Orleans. It has made, and will make, our work doubly difficult, because these employers have refused and do

refuse to confer for the adjustment of difficulties and disputes when they are led to believe by declaration that property is in danger of confiscation.

We have been asked how many trade unionists there are in Congress. I venture to say that there are more trade unionists in Congress and in our state legislatures holding clear cards than there are elsewhere in similar positions the world over. Do you suppose the socialists want trade unionists elected to Congress and to the legislatures?

[Delegate J. Keyes. "No."]

Of course, no. Of course, Socialist Brother Keyes, "No." I am proud of you, Brother Keyes, for your honesty in admitting it. But what Brother Keyes has just admitted on the floor is very true of every other socialist in the convention. As a matter of fact, wherever there has been a trade unionist candidate for any political office if there have been half a dozen socialists in town they have always tried to defeat the trade unionists.

Now, there has been a remark made about the passage of the military law by Congress. I agree it would have been a good thing if we could have prevented the passage of that law, but the delegate said that if we even had a minority in Congress it could not have become law. I point him to the fact that in Germany they have the largest number of any party in the parliament of that country, and yet they have the most tyrannical military laws of any country on the globe. . . .

I am not with your party because I want to be in line with the declaration that the trade union policy, the movement and the work, must be unhampered by your political nostrums.

When the socialists formed the American Labor Union in rivalry to the A. F. of L., I took occasion to continually say in *The American Federationist* that it was but another attempt to form another socialist trade and labor alliance without its practical courage to openly declare its enmity to the American trade union movement.

Is it not a fact that no matter what we achieve, we are belittled by the socialists? Even the Labor Day we have achieved for all the people of our country—the proposition comes in here to abolish it and to make Labor Day in line with the Labor Day of continental Europe, May 1st. The A. F. of L. in 1889 addressed a letter to the French workingmen, suggesting to them

to celebrate the first of May when the carpenters were to inaugurate the eight-hour day; and from that suggestion, made by your humble servant, they have made the first of May of each year their holiday, and how do they celebrate it, usually on the Sunday before or the Sunday after. They take no holiday, but they sometimes celebrate in the evening of May 1st.

In no country on the globe has labor ever taken a day for itself without asking consent, or begging or apologizing for itself, except in this country. And yet the socialists want us to give up our own Labor Day and celebrate on May 1st, I suppose in the evening.

The secretary of the Socialist Party has severed his connection with the reformed (?) Socialist Party, because of his being opposed to the hostile tactics of that party to the trade unions; and, being at heart a trade unionist, he was forced out of his position. Since that time he has given to the world the real reasons why he was forced out—because he dared to stand up in defense of trade unions and against the policy of antagonizing the trade unions and hoisting up the American Labor Union.

Is it not true, to a very great extent, that your socialistic American Labor Union, except the miners and a very few others, is made up very largely of expelled members of the trade unions who broke faith with their fellow-workmen? Do you socialists here deny it? Your official papers say so, and your socialist organizers' reports admit it. Are your socialist unions not boycotting the International Boot and Shoe Workers' Union label and the International Papermakers' Union label, and other international unions, and where they do not boycott them, hold the threat over the heads of some other unions, compelling them either to submit, or forcing them to waver in their fealty and loyalty to the movement?

The Cigarmakers' Union of Denver has had this condition of things confront it. They were threatened with a socialist boycott of their label, and their president and those poor fellows, many of whom can not labor elsewhere, must submit to the dictates of the socialist organization, for they have no other alternative except to get out of Denver. Because they can not otherwise work and support themselves, they must submit, or be boycotted by socialists out of the beneficent climate of Denver, and driven elsewhere, to pine away from the ravages of that dread disease

from which so many suffer and by reason of which they sought that climate for the relief afforded.

Men of labor, if you were in the office of the A. F. of L. for a time and you knew the things that transpire in the labor movement in a general and in a specific way—for they are all focussed there, and we know what is going on and we know the enemies of the labor movement—you would have your opinion clear cut upon this subject. Why, we have spent more money in organizing in Colorado itself than in any other state, notwithstanding that, industrially considered, it ought to cost very little.

I want to tell you socialists that I have studied your philosophy; read your works upon economics, and not the meanest of them; studied your standard works, both in English and German —have not only read, but studied them. I have heard your orators and watched the work of your movement the world over. I have kept close watch upon your doctrines for thirty years; have been closely associated with many of you, and know how you think and what you propose. I know, too, what you have up your sleeve. And I want to say that I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. I declare it to you, I am not only at variance with your doctrines, but with your philosophy.

Economically, you are unsound; socially, you are wrong; industrially, you are an impossibility.—*From address at Boston Convention of A. F. of L., December, 1903.*

The natural organization of the wage-earners; the historic development of associated effort of the toiling masses; the work of years and years; the only concentrated movement of the working people of our time that has brought the toiling masses out of the slough of misery and despond; the organization that forms the only barrier for their protection against modern greed and avarice, and which has placed us in the splendid position of vantage we now enjoy—the trade unions—these have been decried and denounced by men who, hiding their villainy and hypocrisy under the cloak of friendship for labor, bombastically declared and now boast that our unions must be disrupted, divided, and destroyed.

And what the reason? Because the American trade union movement declines to permit itself to become committed to a speculative, theoretical doctrine; declines the domination of our

movement by fantastical doctrinaires; declines to be made a tail to the kite of a political party, the head and front of which are out of touch and out of real sympathy with the struggles, the hopes, the real aspirations of the toiling masses in their effort to attain practical, tangible results in a rational and natural movement.

And what the purpose? That in the destruction of the only genuinely protective organization of the working people they may become abjectly powerless, either to protect or promote their economic interests. The fool hope is entertained that in their desperation the impoverished workmen will inaugurate a physical force revolution and confiscate all property. In another way it is a repetition of the appeal and advice to the workers to "be content with their lot" here and now, and postpone their effort for material improvement to the sweet bye and bye of the hereafter. Quite apart from the consideration of either the unsoundness or impracticability of their philosophy and doctrines, the whole history of man testifies to this one fact, that the more impoverished a people are, or become, the less capable and the less inclined are they to defend their interests and their rights; the less qualified are they to conceive them, defend them, or, if necessary, contend and fight for them.

There are but two hypotheses upon which can be explained the conduct of those who endeavor to engineer the scheme of trade union disruption; one, that they are incompetent derelicts on the industrial sea, a constant menace to the trade union crafts; or, second, that they are in league with the worst elements of antagonistic capitalism to render as effective service as they can to try and confuse, diffuse, pervert, and make trade union activity the least possibly effective.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Pittsburgh, Pa., November, 1905.*

In 1890 the first open effort was made to gain an entering wedge for the [socialist] party to dominate the labor movement of America. The Central Labor Union of New York City, dominated by the socialist political party, surrendered its charter to the A. F. of L. Later, desirous of retrieving its mistake, the C. L. U. made application for a charter, which was refused because the socialist political party was represented in the central body. Upon this issue, the socialists determined to make their

fight upon the A. F. of L. They planned to make a great onslaught upon the A. F. of L. convention at Detroit. The party leaders came with the backing of the political socialists of America for the purpose of dominating the convention, and forcing an economic organization to recognize the right of a delegate of a political party to representation in its deliberations. . . .

The central body of New York receded from its position, excluded the representatives of the socialist political party from representation and applied for a charter. The charter was then granted, and the New York Central Federated Union has been in entire harmony and cordial relations with the A. F. of L. from that day to this. That ended the effort of the socialist political party to secure direct representation as a party in the councils of the A. F. of L. or in its central bodies. . . .

In 1893, Mr. Eugene V. Debs, while an officer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, accepted the presidency of the so-called American Railway Union and worked with might and main for the extermination of all the railroad brotherhoods, the bona fide unions of the railway workers. Mr. Debs was supported in his efforts by the socialist political party of the country, which endorsed the new organization.

Later, Mr. Debs having failed in this one object, he dissolved his American Railway Union and established the so-called American Labor Union, with the avowed purpose of crushing the American trade union movement as comprehended and understood by the wage-earners united in the A. F. of L. In this course of action he had the fullest support of the socialist political party of America. Because the political partyites who claimed to be inspired by utopian ideals but condescended to the political practices of machine politics of the type used by corrupt politicians, were still unable to dominate the American labor movement and harness it to their political kite, they undertook to organize an economic movement that would be all their own and therefore pliant and usable. Then the socialist political party entered the economic field where the workers were already organized and began "to organize."

The so-called Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was launched with the open declaration that it was to destroy and drive out of existence the A. F. of L., and to supplant it by their high sounding titled organization. That, too, went by the board.

In 1905 was formed the preposterous Industrial Workers of the World, and again the "trade union movement was doomed." The same socialist representatives who had taken the initiative in every effort to break down trade unionism assembled for the creation of this new enemy masquerading as a movement of the workers of the world. But these artificialities could not be engrafted upon the healthy, normal American trade union movement.

The socialist political party adherents openly declared and fondly hoped that this newest effort would surely within a very brief time disintegrate the trade union movement, the A. F. of L. How these conglomerations, these fantastic vaporescences—the creations of the fervid brains of the socialist political party leaders—fared, is history too well known to be recounted here.

Less than a year ago, Mr. Eugene V. Debs made a stirring appeal for the disruption of the A. F. of L., addressing himself to the United Mine Workers of America and to the Western Federation of Miners, exhorting them to withdraw from the A. F. of L. and to set up a rival organization to it.

But neither the irritating, pin-pricking tactics of the socialist politicians' local assaults and disrupting methods, personal attacks upon and vilifications of trade unionists, nor vulture-like attacks upon the labor movement, have prevented the growth and the forward progress of the A. F. of L.

For more than thirty years the socialist political party in one form or another never halted, never stopped, in the effort either to capture the A. F. of L., the trade union movement, or, in the language of the street, "to put it in a hole."

After being frustrated in the effort at direct representation of the party in the A. F. of L., proposition after proposition was introduced in order to commit the organization to socialist policies. For fully fifteen years, at each successive convention of the A. F. of L., socialist representatives sought to fasten upon the movement a declaration favoring state socialism, the government to be the employer, the workers to enlist to toil in governmental employment wearing industro-political straitjackets. To quote again Brand Whitlock's trenchant remark, "Socialists would provide for everything except freedom." Beaten and halted by the discussion and the unfailing discernment and uncompromising decisions of the delegates to the conventions of

the general labor movement of America, this pretentious effort of the socialist political party failed to fasten its tentacles upon our movement. . . .

Because the officers of the labor movement endeavored to bring the gospel of labor to large employers with a view of reaping some advantage to the toilers of our country, they were made the object of vicious and defamatory attacks. The socialist politicians tried to create the impression that their efforts to further the welfare of the workers were efforts to work in collusion with employers of labor. The charge, no matter how often and insistently repudiated by the leaders of the labor movement of our country, was repeated with ever-increasing virulence. Over and over in written and spoken statements I have repeatedly asserted that there was not and could not be harmony of interests between workmen and employers, but that has not stopped willful misrepresentation. If any reader doubts what I here aver, ask any socialist politician.

The socialist politicians knew well that there was no ground for charges and insinuations of insincerity or faithlessness on the part of the American trade unionists, but they predicated their campaign of misrepresentation and vilification upon the old concept that if mud is thrown often enough and in sufficient quantities, the hope may be entertained that some of it will stick.

But hopes and concepts in this direction have miscarried and the campaign of opposition was then changed to another tack. This time it was to raise the hue and cry for so-called "Industrial Unionism, one big union." And this doctrine was harped upon in season and out of season for several years in the effort to have the American trade union movement disrupt organizations which have done so much for the toilers in improving their standards and conditions of life, and follow a will-o'-the-wisp. . . .

In the New York *Call* (socialist paper), April 8, 1910, Robert Hunter said:

"We ought never to have derided the unions, jeered at their every weakness or chuckled over their every mistake. That was the first error, and a terrible one. It was the error the Germans made at first, although they soon squared themselves. And it is a fact that in no other country has this error persisted as it has in America, and it is also a fact that if we continue to persist in this error we shall create a situation which will put socialism back many years."

Morris Hillquit, hailed by all socialists as the most brilliant socialist of to-day, in the New York *Call* of December 12, 1909, said:

"Socialism in the United States to-day is in the anomalous position of being a working-class movement, minus the working class, and our main efforts must be to remove that anomaly. Our efforts to enlist the support of the working class must necessarily be directed in the first place to the organized portion of it. And whatever may be said to the contrary, our party has never made sustained and rational efforts to win the friendship of these organized workmen. Much of our time and energies in the past have been wasted in the effort to capture the trade union movement bodily; in a few instances we have been led to the folly of attempting to reorganize it, going to the extent of creating rival organizations and at times have meddled and interfered with their internal affairs. We have often tried to coax, cajole, and browbeat the trade unions into socialism."

In the *Call* of December 11, 1909, William English Walling, declared that:

"The Socialist Party has become a hissing and a by-word with the actual wage-workers of America. It has become a party of two extremes. On the one side are a bunch of intellectuals like myself and Spargo and Hunter and Hillquit; on the other is a bunch of 'never-works,' demagogues and would-be intellectuals, a veritable *lumpen proletariat.* The actual wage-workers, the men who are really fighting the class struggle, are outside. Above all else we must have the union men. No one has denounced the defects of the A. F. of L. more than I, but I am forced to recognize that it comes much nearer representing the working class than the Socialist Party and unless we are able to so shape our policies and our organization as to meet the demands and incarnate the position of the workers we will have failed of our mission."

—From pamphlet, "The Workers and The Eight-Hour Work-Day," 1915.

A staff writer of the New York *Giornale Italiano* (socialist), after giving in full the municipal program of the Prussian socialists, as adopted at their congress this winter—a program which calls for democratic administration, home rule, lay schools, the higher education, health laws, free public libraries, comfort stations, public baths, playgrounds, slaughter houses, and municipal "utilities" in general—records this sober protest:

If it is true that to arrive at the socialistic society it is necessary to abolish private property and establish the socialization of the means of production and exchange (the work of demolishing the present society, in which all the so-called revolutionary parties agree, though they may divide on reconstructive ideas), in what relation to these

principles stand all the demands contained in this Prussian program? Program of reforms, aye; of change in the existing social institutions, tending to their preservation, very well; but a socialistic program, no, unless it is accepted in good faith that the Socialist Party has become a radical-conservative party (in spite of the apparent contradiction in terms of this dual name), renouncing its old original program, by which alone it can have the right still to call itself socialist.

Precisely! Leader [Robert] Hunter's dilemma, in the light of this criticism from an intransigeant socialist, becomes a repretition of the dilemma in which the doctrinaire socialists of Germany found themselves years ago upon several successive epoch-making occasions for their party. As revolutionary politicians they had long frowned upon the "mere palliative" reform measures of trade unions and other forces and elements in every community of every country. But working-class reformers, without and within their ranks, who refused to starve or deteriorate according to orthodox socialist doctrine of evolution or devolution, compelled them to take up with, notably, trade unionism, coöperation, and municipal betterments. That is, many German socialists, like sensible men, fell in line with a progressive evolutionary program which rapidly led to an increased well-being for the masses in their country—with the social cataclysm gradually relegated to the domain of Mother Shipton's prophecies. —*American Federationist, April, 1910.*

Once that our present society has gathered momentum in an upward direction, sound reason exists to doubt both Marx's diagnosis that society is inevitably passing through a revolution determined by the laws of materialist evolution and his prophecy of a coming economic order based on "socialized" ownership and operation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange —land and capital. Every stage gained in amelioration for the masses, every introduction of an uplifting social principle and process, every remedy established in correcting faulty institutions, every movement of the working class itself that brings to it an increasing share of the wealth produced, every statute that loosens the monopolistic grip of the privileged classes on law-making, on the raw materials of nature, or on those forms of so-called capital which are but legalized tribute capitalized—all such steps picture an accelerating momentum of society in a movement away from Marx's prophesied necessity for an over-

turning of the fundamental principles of our existing social order. . . .

When the foundation of Marx's theories—the idea of surplus value—is demonstrably an error, when, on the contrary, the possibilities for the arrival of the working-classes at a general plane that will permit the full development of manhood become certainties, his ingeniously worked out correlatives of this first principle have no more value than the imaginings of any other guesser at probabilities for the future. His time-wage system, his co-operative commonwealth, and especially his notions as to religion and the family, then take their place with the fanciful divagations of Jules Verne and H. G. Wells when fashioning their perfect new worlds out of this unlovely old one.—*American Federationist, June, 1910.*

Acting as they have done in every other crisis of union labor, the socialists have employed the McNamara incident, with its *dénouement,* simply for the purpose of partisan propaganda. As usual, they have principally used it as a basis for renewed clamor against Samuel Gompers, as representing what they denounce as "rank conservatism." George R. Lunn, socialist Mayor of Schenectady, declared himself thus :"It means the end of the American Federation of Labor, or, at any rate, a complete revolution within the organization, and the Waterloo of Gompers." The *Literary Digest* has this: "John Spargo, a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, denounces Gompers and other union leaders as 'men whose teaching inevitably lead to the kind of thing to which the McNamaras have confessed, however clean their own hands may be from crime.' " The *Digest* article continues:

" 'Violence,' says A. M. Simons, editor of the *Coming Nation* (socialist), 'is a logical result of an attempt to wage the class struggle without the ballot.' Fred D. Warren, editor of the *Appeal to Reason* (socialist), asserts that 'had the McNamara brothers understood the philosophy of socialism they would never have resorted to deeds of violence in the hope of benefiting the oppressed poor.' "

In accordance with the socialist program, the Chicago *Daily Socialist,* gave prominence to the following by Allen Cook:

"The working class must tear themselves away from the fake leaders who are betraying them into the hands of their enemies. Gompers and Mitchell and other fake leaders advise them to vote for capitalism

and then raise a great 'hue and cry' when capitalism starts to carry out its program. These fake leaders coax and drive the working people into the shambles and then pretend to pity them while they are being slaughtered. The worst enemies that the working class have in America are the fake labor leaders and the fake labor papers which shout unionism from the housetops and then advise the working men to vote a scab, capitalistic ticket. Many of these fake leaders receive pay from capitalistic sources. Some of them have been members and are now members of the Civic Federation, organized by J. Pierpont Morgan, Belmont and Mark Hanna for the purpose of destroying the labor unions. Some of these fake labor leaders are supported by money received from capitalistic sources. These fake labor leaders and papers advise the working people to lick the hand that smites them and to fondle at the foot that stamps them into the earth."

Eugene V. Debs, in the January *International Socialist Review,* in "The McNamara Case and the Labor Movement," thus responds to a tip as to the tactics to be adopted by the socialists in their comments on the dynamiting incident:

"Admitting that the McNamaras are guilty of all they are charged with in the way of dynamiting buildings and bridges, *their acts are the logical outcome of the impotency* and *hopelessness* of the *craft form* of *unionism,* typified by Samuel Gompers and his official associates in the American Federation of Labor, and of which the condemned men are faithful disciples and loyal devotees."

Yet Mr. Debs has this passage in the same article:

"Under the ethical code of capitalism the slaying of workingmen who resist capitalism is not murder, and as a workingman I absolutely refuse to condemn men as murderers under the moral code of the capitalist class for fighting according to their light on the side of the working class. If the McNamara brothers had been corporation detectives and had shot dead twenty-one inoffensive union pickets, instead of placing dynamite under the Los Angeles *Times,* they would have been protected by the law and hailed by admiring capitalists as heroes."

Mr. Debs' declaration in regard to the McNamaras suggests a substantial agreement of his views, at times, with those of William D. Haywood. A few weeks ago, in Cooper Union, New York, Haywood, now an organizer of the socialist Industrial Workers of the World, declared, in a speech:

"Can you wonder that I despise the law? I understand the class struggle. I am not a law-abiding citizen. More than that, I do not believe you here ought to be law-abiding citizens. . . . The McNamara boys, who went to San Quentin out of Los Angeles, know what the class struggle means. They knew and for that reason my heart is with them. . . . And again I repeat, I am with the McNamaras and always will be. Let us socialists be frank. We want to overthrow the capitalist system, and establish in its place an industrial democracy. Why then say we are law-abiding? I believe in coercion. . . . Workingmen know no country. There are no foreigners among the workers, except

one kind only. These lone foreigners are the capitalists, and they ride us harder and harder every year. Socialism means we will have them off our backs, and our industrial organization should be a fine, defensive fighting machine. Better no organization of any kind than one that makes contracts to lie dead for a year or three years, and be out of the struggle. You know if we had this organization we could protect our lives at work, shorten our hours, and finally declare a general lockout, backed up by armed warfare against the capitalists. Try it, fellow-workers. You have only your chains to lose and a world to gain." . . .

Victor Berger, in a signed article, "Should Be Prepared to Fight for Liberty at All Hazards," in the Milwaukee *Social Democratic Herald,* July 31, 1909 (which was copied in the Chicago *Daily Socialist,* August 31, 1909), thus gave the world his views as to violent revolutionary methods:

"No one will claim that I am given to the reciting of 'revolutionary' phrases. On the contrary, I am known to be a 'constructive' socialist. However, in view of the plutocratic law-making of the present day, it is easy to predict that the safety and hope of this country will finally lie in *one direction* only—that of a violent and bloody revolution. Therefore, I say, each of the 500,000 socialist voters, and of the two million working men who instinctively incline our way, should, besides doing much reading and still more thinking, also have a good rifle and the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home and be prepared to back up his ballot with his bullets if necessary. This may look like a startling statement. Yet I can see nothing else for the American masses to-day. The working class of this country is being pushed hopelessly downward. We must resist as long as resistance is possible. . . . Besides, there is now no hope for any protection for the *working class* in this country. Protection for the *plutocrat,* the *exploiter* and big *thief*—is the watchword in Washington, D. C., and in every Legislature and court of record in the United States. Our United States Senators of the Aldrich and Lodge type, honestly believe that the American people, and particularly the working class, are existing solely for the purpose of being *exploited by our ruling class.* Exploited once as *producers* by creating surplus values for their masters who own the production, then exploited again as *consumers,* by paying as much as possible to their masters who own the distribution. Now, I deny that dealing with a blind and greedy plutocratic class as we are dealing in this country, the outcome can ever be peaceable or that any reasonable change can ever be brought about by the ballot in the end. I predict that a large part of the capitalist class will be wiped out for much smaller things than the settling of the great social question. That before any settlement is possible, most of the plutocratic class, together with the politicians, will have to disappear as completely as the feudal lords and their retinue disappeared during the French revolution. That can not be done by the ballot, or by *only* the ballot. The ballot may not count for much in a pinch. And in order to be prepared for all emergencies, socialists and workingmen should make it their duty to have rifles and the necessary rounds of ammunition at their homes, and be prepared to back up their ballots with their bullets if necessary."

Nor need we quote the expressions within the recent years as to the attitude of socialists regarding violence. During the Socialist Congress at The Hague in 1872, Karl Marx said:

"In most countries in Europe violence must be the lever of our social reform. We must finally have recourse to violence in order to establish the rule of labor. The revolution must be universal."

But to return to more recent socialist utterances from one of which I shall quote. The Socialist *Call,* of New York, December 5, 1911, published an editorial covering nearly the entire page, under the caption, "The Silencing of Samuel." I shall quote a few choice morsels:

"It is true that the policy he (Gompers) championed—despite his repudiation of violence—ultimately and inevitably generates the McNamara type in the ranks of organized labor. . . .

"It is true that Mr. Gompers advocated peaceful measures, but at the same time he championed a policy that in the last extremity made peaceful methods impossible.

"It can not be explained by your (Gompers) ludicrous theory that the dynamiters were 'crazy.' That at once invites the retort that the policy laid down for them by organized labor—your policy—was unworkable, and drove them crazy—that such lunacy is contagious.

. . . "And even if you (Gompers) were the latter (a martyr), the sacrifice is in vain, for you can not prevent your tormentors from using this incident to practically DESTROY THE UNIONS."

Reader, do you observe the declaration, the expressed belief, the hidden wish, that labor's enemies will practically "destroy the unions?"

And now, this additional sentence from the same editorial in *The Call:*

"You (Gompers) may rest assured that your policy will from time to time produce such exponents of 'principle' as the McNamaras, despite your feeble assurance that organized labor is not responsible for them."

Read the utterances of Kirby, Parry, Post, Burns, Drew, and the rest of their ilk; read the attacks of the worst enemies in the capitalist press, and compare the identity with socialist thought and language.

In the foregoing hodge-podge of socialistic rant, whether the leaders of socialism are in one breath calling for blood or in another washing their hands of it, the one thought usually sure to come out is that the policies of American trade unionism are utterly misleading and ruinous to labor and that the source of

these policies is Gomperism. This cry comes from the socialists, as we have said, on every occasion when they find an opportunity to get in a blow at the unions. Some of the socialist leaders are members of trade unions, but in no instance are they trade unionists. They are fanatical, and therefore unscrupulous, socialistic vote-hunters. They are trying to supplant the trade union movement by a mass voting machine. As results of their manifold attempts to attain this purpose, they can sum up a few discreditable points of disgraceful success in a total failure. They have, to wit, found themselves simultaneously with Otis, Kirby, Post & Co., attacking trade unionism and knifing its officials; they have, to some extent, as tumultuously self-professed "labor men," confused the public mind with respect to labor's real policies and demands; they have, on the occasion of several large strikes, especially among unskilled or unorganized wage-workers, substituted irreconcilable class hostility toward employers for the trade union sentiment that supports efforts to reach agreement in practical matters of hours, wages, and conditions, which might be arranged between the two sides of the labor market in the occupation or industry immediately interested. And yet, with all their frothy and fiery propaganda, their party—or parties—are continually in a state of internal disturbance and dissension and their leaders lost in fifty-seven varieties of utopian dreams. All told, the net effect of their wish and their ceaseless endeavors to tear the trade unionism of this country to pieces is seen in the fact that the membership in the American trade unions has increased hundreds of thousands every year. Since the McNamara confessions there has not been the slightest defection from the ranks of the unions.

All the errors and faults of trade unionism in the eyes of socialists fall within the limits of a single crime. That crime is that the American Federation of Labor refuses to become the tail to the socialistic kite. The socialist leaders know full well that there is no truth otherwise in their arraignment of the trade union movement and of trade union officials. They know that in trade unionism there is positively no "Gomperism," no fatuous conservatism that refuses consideration to radical ideas, no entangling alliance with capitalism, no respect for the unearned wealth of plutocracy, no thought of putting on the brakes against progressive thought, no compromise with the spirit that is blind to

the advances of the times toward economic justice, no "chloroforming" of any thought or sentiment that points to a speedy evolution of society—aye, even on upward to the millennium. —*American Federationist, February, 1912.*

The tendency among alleged revolutionary party parliamentary representatives in France, Germany, Italy, England, and Austria, has of recent years been to sink revolution and to take up with reform. Practical socialism has plainly become in those countries a step-by-step progressiveness. Its main efforts have been given to promoting the education of the masses in the public schools, advocating the cause of universal suffrage, eliminating aristocratic privilege, joining with other parties in the separation of Church and State, and preaching theoretically the suppression of militarism while in fact quite uniformly acting in accordance with the dictates of patriotism. . . .

It may be accurately said, broadly, that some of the political labor parties which started out in Europe during the last half century with proclamations of intention to accomplish the complete overturn of society show to-day, by their campaign printed matter, by the speeches of their members of Parliament, and by the declarations of their conventions, that much of their time is now taken up with immediate demands of a character which in America would mostly be but echoes of our own pre-revolutionary grievances. Our Government and our society have reached a stage further along in democracy's development. And, by the way, compared with the proclaimed approaching tremendous upheaval of society, announced in the manifestoes of the early apostles of revolutionary parliamentarism, the actual proposals of the radical parties before the parliaments of the various European nations generally indicate huge satisfaction with the capture of comparatively very small game.—*American Federationist, May, 1912.*

Our civilization is on so large a scale, and is so complicated, that organization is essential to attaining desired results. But real progress is dependent upon whether the organization is subservient to and utilized by the individual, or the individual is dominated by the system. This is the great menace of socialism and socialistic proposals that would reduce differences between

individuals to the minimum and manage the universe by a card index system. Organization is necessary, as the workers have good reason to know. But organization must be made the instrument which serves the purposes of individuals and which enables them to attain their fullest development. . . .

There are many wrongs in the world, but to claim they can be righted by suppressing individual initiative by national or world organization of endeavor, products, and methods is to take the heart out of things. What we need to do is to cease warping lives of individuals and to allow them space and opportunity to live, move, and possess their own consciences. Give to every person who performs work that satisfies a social need wages and conditions which will enable him to be his best self and he will not need a society to conserve his conscience. First give the individual a chance before taking from him that which would leave him poor indeed.—*American Federationist, November, 1913.*

I believe it is the duty of man to make his life and that of his fellows better to-day—to-day, not in the remote future, but to-day—that he may be better prepared, by reason of his improved conditions, to meet the human problems that will confront him to-morrow. That policy is diametrically opposed to the principles enunciated by Karl Marx in his work on socialism—"Das Kapital."

About twenty-seven years ago I undertook to learn the German language for the purpose of reading "Das Kapital" of Karl Marx in the original, and I have read the very best of what the philosophers and writers on socialism have had to say, as I have read and tried to digest that which the best economists of the past three hundred years have had to say. Without egotism, and I hope little if any vanity, I will say I came to the conclusion many years ago that it is our duty to live our lives as workers in the society in which we live and not to work for the downfall or the destruction or the overthrow of that society, but for its fuller development and evolution, that life may be the better worth the living; and if in the course of that effort some men are inconvenienced, then it is not to be ascribed to the failure of that natural and evolutionary movement, but rather to the credit of that movement, because it is the great conservator of the peace

and of the public welfare.—*From abstract of testimony before House Lobby Investigation Committee, Washington, D. C., December, 1913.*

Mr. Sinclair is sadly behind the times. He has, with the stubbornness of a zealot, closed his ears to the mature conclusions formed by a competent majority in all countries relative to the revolutionary program which, in making the seductive circuit of hot radicalisms, he has recently given support. These conclusions in brief are: The postulates for his socialistic propositions—increasing misery, concentrated monopoly, the passing of power from the many to the few—are errors fully disposed of in all our civilization by rapidly accumulating data; his views of present social conditions arise from recklessly distorting fact through habitually magnifying the evil and minimizing the good; time has exploded the recorded woeful prophecies of his party founders; his pessimistic philosophy, with its teachings of impending violent social upheaval, has been rejected by the normal mind, even among the German socialists, as a mental poison and social dry-rot, and his proposed coöperative commonwealth has repeatedly been voted down by the English voluntary coöperators, well aware that its tyranny would be worse than any autocracy ever known to the world, inevitably annihilating the bases of personal independence and character. . . .

Take Mr. Sinclair's gibe at us (Samuel Gompers) as being "disturbed over the jail sentences which are hanging over his head." Mr. Sinclair's habit of misstatement could not permit him to refer correctly even to the facts in this case. The case in question illustrates clearly the difference between socialist procedure and trade union procedure in this country in a contest for the rights of the citizen as against encroachments by the courts. The socialists would have treated the case as a cause for party propaganda, for denouncing existing society, and for demanding revolution. The trade unionists, who believe that all the rights of citizenship, all the rights of human beings, can be gained under our Republic, have conducted the case to protect constitutional rights. The result has been not only a series of victories in the courts themselves but the education of the whole country and the consequent support of a host of non-wage-working Americans for the cause of the American Federation of Labor.

Observe the procedure of the courts in this case: A sweeping injunction; a revision of this injunction by a higher court which wiped out all the inhibitions except two; a jail sentence for three union officials; an elimination of the jail sentences of two of these officials, with a reduction of the third from a year to a month; an opinion of one of the three judges that no crime had been committed; a rejection by the United States Supreme Court of the findings of all the lower courts; a retrial with an outcome that leaves hardly anything of the original charges, inhibitions, penalties, or powers of the courts. Meanwhile throughout the country has developed a public opinion which regards the case as the test and criterion for all similar ones, which marks a revolution in the attitude not only of the public at large but of the majority of the bar and bench relative to the powers that had been usurped by courts of equity. . . .

No! No revolution! Nothing but carrying this profession of childlike faith into practice. Mr. Sinclair says:

"I believe that to-day the Interstate Commerce Commission could take charge of our railways and abolish the claim of their bondholders to interest and of their stockholders to dividends, either reducing the cost of the service or turning over the profits to the government, precisely as in the case of the post-office, and I do not believe that the fundamental basis of our government and social fabric would be destroyed thereby. I believe that the same thing could be done in the case of express companies, the telegraphs and telephones, the steel trust, the oil trust, and the coal trust. I believe that it could be done in our cities for public service corporations and for land, and still the fundamental basis of our government and social fabric might endure."

Grown men who can read these propositions and not see that of necessity they blot out the present legal system, the established relations of the citizen to property, the independence of every individual, the liberty of movement, speech, press, assemblage—well, such men can believe black white, storm sunshine, war peace, cold heat, truth error, and insanity sanity. Men of such minds see society as through a mist, the creation of their own mental astigmatism.—*American Federationist, April, 1914, "Upton Sinclair's Mental Marksmanship."*

"Socialism makes provision for everything except liberty," asserted Brand Whitlock. The best verification of his assertion is found in New South Wales. There have been established all

manner of governmental agencies for regulating industry and industrial relations.

Now regulation of industrial relations is not a policy to be entered upon lightly—establishment of regulation for one type of relation necessitates regulating of another and then another, until finally all industrial life grows rigid with regulations.

New South Wales began by establishing agencies to prohibit strikes and lockouts. But strikes could not be banished at command in New South Wales or elsewhere, since they are the result of industrial wrongs. It was found necessary to extend the authority given the governmental agencies to include the regulation of wages, hours of work, overtime and any industrial matter. To make one regulation effective, authority to regulate other relations was necessary.

New South Wales is known as a labor governed state and the workers expected to gain great benefits from state regulation. King Midas expected to gain all the joys of existence from the gift of golden touch—but the golden touch made food somewhat indigestible. The workers of New South Wales have found that governmental regulation has undesirable results.—*American Federationist, May, 1915.*

Socialists advocate a theory of the coöperative commonwealth and government ownership of all means of production and distribution, the government to be the thing, the ideal. To strengthen the state as Frederick Howe says, is to devitalize the individual. I am not a pessimist. On the contrary I believe I may justly call myself an optimist. I believe in the people. I believe in the working people. I believe in their growing intelligence. I believe in their growing and persistent demand for better conditions, for a more rightful situation in the industrial, political and social affairs of this country and of the world. I have faith that the working people will better their condition far beyond that which is to-day.

The position of the organized labor movement is not based upon misery and poverty, but upon the right of the workers to a larger and a constantly growing share of the production, and they will work out these problems for themselves.—*From testimony before Congressional Committee, April, 1916, on resolution for a Commission on Social Insurance.*

American labor has kept its trust with democracy and the principles of liberty and justice. It yields to no person or institution in its fidelity and devotion to our Republic. American labor is proud that *fewer conscientious objectors were found in its ranks than among any other group of people.*

Comparison between the pronouncements and activities of individuals and associations who without warrant or authority assume to speak in the name of labor, and the loyal attitude and patriotic declarations and accomplishments of the organized labor movement as represented by the American Federation of Labor, is vivid. I invite careful reading of the paragraphs quoted * elsewhere from "American Labor's Position in Peace or in War," of March 12, 1917, and the following declaration of the American Socialist Party:

"The American people did not want and do not want this war. They have not been consulted about the war and have had no part in declaring war. They have been plunged into this war by the trickery and treachery of the ruling class of the country through its representatives in the National Administration and National Congress, its demagogic agitators, its subsidized press, and other servile instruments of public expression.

"We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world.

"In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.

"No greater dishonor has ever been forced upon a people than that which the capitalist class is forcing upon this nation against its will."

No other influence in our country was viewed with such favor by the autocratic governments of Germany and Austria as was the pernicious propaganda of the socialists to destroy or weaken the forces of democracy in this great struggle.—*From "Our Shield Against Bolshevism," McClure's Magazine, April, 1919.*

THE I. W. W. AND "ONE BIG UNION"

The attempt to force the trade unions into what has been termed industrial organization is perversive of the history of the labor movement, runs counter to the best conceptions of the toilers' interests now, and is sure to lead to the confusion which precedes dissolution and disruption. It is time for the American Federation of Labor to solemnly call a halt. It is time for our

* See page 248.

fellow-unionists entrusted with grave responsibilities to help stem the tide of expansion madness lest either by their indifference or encouragement their organizations will be drawn into the vortex that will engulf them to their possible dismemberment and destruction. There is virtue and a great meed of praise due in organizing our fellow-workers that they may defend and further their interests.

No tribute too great can be paid those engaged in the past and in the present who have done and who are doing this splendid work; but virtue, merit, and tribute must be effaced unless we meet the conditions, aye, the awful calamity which is inevitable if trade union lines are not recognized and enforced—enforced not so much by an edict of this Federation, but by the common sense and power of the organizations themselves. The advocates of the so-called industrial system of labor organizations urge that an effective strike can only be conducted when all workmen, regardless of trade, calling, or occupation, are affected.

That this is not borne out by the history of strikes in the whole labor movement is easily demonstrable. Though here and there such strikes have been temporarily successful, in the main they have been fraught with injury to all. The so-called industrial system of organization implies sympathetic strikes, and these time and experience have demonstrated as a general proposition should be discarded, while strikes of particular trades or callings have had the largest number of successes and the minimum of defeats. Quite apart from these considerations, however, are the splendid advantages obtained by the trade unions without the necessity of strikes or the interruption of industry. No one will attempt to say that a sympathetic strike shall under no circumstances occur. Under certain conditions it may be not only justifiable but practical and successful, even if only as an emphatic protest against a great injustice or wrong; but generally and normally considered, such strikes can not be of advantage.

One feature in connection with a system of industrial organization and its concomitant, the sympathetic strike, has been overlooked. By its methods any one of our international organizations could be financially drained and actually ruined in a very brief period in an effort to sustain the members involved; while, on the other hand, in a well-formulated trade union movement, a large number of men of different crafts, belonging to their own

respective international trade unions, could be indefinitely sustained financially and victory achieved. At least the organizations maintained, not only to continue that battle, but to take up the cudgels in defense of their members elsewhere.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Boston, Mass., November, 1903.*

If a policy of so-called industrial form of organization be justifiable and advantageous, as against that of the trade union form, with its constant development, with changing conditions in industry, then an organization formed a few months ago in San Antonio, Tex., is the best expression and exponent of that notion, for that organization sneers contemptuously at the organization of the different unions of the building trades, and styles itself "The United Brotherhood of Builders of America." It denounces roundly the trade unions, and in the usual language of the so-called industrialists invites to membership in the one organization carpenters and plumbers, painters and bricklayers, plasterers and bridge and structural iron workers, electrical workers and hod carriers, building laborers and machinists, and every man who is either directly or remotely employed in the preparation of the material for a building or in the construction of the building itself. It necessarily follows that if such a form of organization is most advantageous to the workmen employed in the building trades, it will apply with equal advantage to all others. This is the logical result of the reasoning of some of our mistaken fellow trade unionists who, with more enthusiasm than clearness of vision, urge what they euphoneously call an industrial form of organization.

Our trade union movement, which deals with conditions as they arise and takes advantage of experience to turn it to the best account of our fellow workmen, may not be so alluring; it may not bear the apparent glamor and dash which some would have the labor movement assume, but ours is the movement of labor, founded upon the historic development of the toilers' associated effort; it battles in labor's interests to-day, and is marshaling the forces of united labor in its regiments and battalions the better to defend, the better to withstand, the better to maintain, the better to clear the pathway for a safer and more successful advance to-morrow and to-morrow.

To the fanciful that movement may be slower than that which they conjecture, but it is the most rapid because it is the most natural, rational, and safe. Students and observers of our movement do not regard it as of slow progress. They are astonished at the rapidity and comprehensiveness with which we are moving onward and forward.

May the day never come when, by an attempt at overrunning, we miss or lose our goal, and rent asunder, weak and helpless, become the victims of the cupidity and rapacity of labor's foes. —*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, San Francisco, November, 1904.*

There are some who would divide existing forces of organized labor under the pretense that the trade union movement does not expand its effort to cover all the workers of a given industry, who would dismember our trade unions of to-day under the delusive notion that all the workers in a given industry, regardless of trade or calling, could then be organized into what they are pleased to term an industrial union. They evidently imagine that the trade union movement was "made to order" in a mold, that it is a fixture. They are entirely oblivious of the fact that the trade union movement in its origin, growth, workings and development is, primarily and historically, the movement of the wage-workers, by the wage-workers, for the wage-workers; that its growth and expansion are apace with the growth and advancement of the wage-earners, and that the coöperation of the workers in a given industry and of all industry must come through a natural, orderly and well-defined course as a result of necessity and experience.

The trade union movement sets no hard and fast lines for itself. It reckons with the workmen as they are, and not as it would wish them to be. It undertakes to deal with them and the problems confronting them so that they may make, as they are making, the trade union movement broader, more comprehensive and effective for their own good as well as for the common good of all.

In the past, aye, even in our own time, we have witnessed the inauguration of movements of a so-called industrial character and which proved to be movements that did not move, the most conspicuous of which was the Knights of Labor, whose policy of

industrialism and antagonism to the trade union movement proved its own undoing.

Our experience has demonstrated that drastic efforts to prematurely bring workmen of kindred trades into coöperation or amalgamation have aroused greater hostility and resentment and driven them farther apart. The policy pursued by our movement is to encourage the feelings of amity and fraternity among the men in the different organizations of labor of a given or a kindred industry, and to inaugurate an alliance so that in time an amalgamation may result in one comprehensive organization. The number of affiliated organizations under the titles of "International Unions" and "Amalgamated Associations" now in existence, in which the fullest development on this line has been established, is the best testimony of the wisdom and the practicability of the course and policy pursued by the trade union movement for which the American Federation of Labor stands. Recent doings of so-called "Industrialists" present the other view. Who can hesitate in his choice?—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Minneapolis, Minn., November, 1906.*

Syndicalism in Europe marks reaction against "puttering parliamentary socialism." What is heard of it as at work in the United States signifies simply the latest development of hot-head resentment against our economic conditions. Some of our excitable revolutionary dreamers have turned revolutionaries by act—on the spot. They have only jumped from pan to fire.

Just when socialists are syndicalists, and syndicalists socialists, it is difficult to determine. In no country do the socialists refuse to profit by any of the rash steps of the syndicalists. Some of the syndicalists proclaim themselves socialists. The war-cries of the extremists among the political partisan anarchists and socialists are the same war-cries which are used by the economic syndicalists. . . .

The ultimate object of syndicalism as a movement is the social revolution through an all-encompassing general strike of the working classes. The non-wage-working classes are to be deprived of their sustenance, and thus terrorized into acceptance of the new social system which will be imposed upon them by the "syndicates." This system will represent the unified wage-workers of the various industries, who will take possession and

operate the natural and other media essential to production. Government will give way to "syndicalistic ownership and operation of the means of production and distribution." Fantastic though the scheme may appear in America, it has its adherents by the many thousands, especially in the Latin countries of Europe. . . .

Industrial unionism, so called (for no comprehensive definition has as yet been found to prescribe its boundary lines, or to classify the elements to be contained therein), is a theory which, if carried to its logical (or better still, illogical) conclusion, is harking back to the primitive battlefield. The advocates of this form of organization, at least a great many of them, assume that the organizations of labor can be successfully combined into one gigantic union, and the power of that union so concentrated that it would, or could, be moved on an instant's notice, as an automaton. Were it possible to reach a condition of this character—the concentration of power necessary to carry out the objects desired—the democracy which now exists in our unions would, as already shown, give way to autocracy. Power would be at the top, and not at the foundation, as now exemplified by the local unions. . . . Whatever changes that are to occur will come as a development, and not as a cataclysm. . . .

Syndicalism has not the faintest show of success in America, nor has any other "ism" which does not contemplate an opportunist movement through obviously needed reforms toward economic justice, step by step, in accordance with the convictions of the majority in community, State, Nation, and Continent.—*American Federationist, May, 1912.*

The I. W. W. is destructive in theory and in practice. It would destroy the State and the ownership of property and substitute for these voluntary collectivism or a form of anarchy. It claims that the campaign of education and that constant reform are antiquated and ineffective, advocates "direct action," and the destruction of the present that Utopia may be superimposed on the ruins. As the Industrial Workers of the World state in their own literature: "There is just one bargain the Industrial Workers of the World will make with the employing class—complete surrender of all control of industry to the organized workers." Since the purpose is to subvert present economic

conditions and principles, all policies and methods are destructive. They say society is composed of two classes—the employing and the employed—whose interests are diametrically opposed and incapable of conciliation. Hence the wrongs of the employed can be righted only by dispossessing the employers. Upon this basis their program is prepared.

So irrevocable and so ineradicable do they consider the line of demarcation between the two classes that one of their interpreters, Mr. Pouget, even postulates for them two distinct systems of morality:

"The truth is that, as there exist two classes in society, so there exist two moralities, the bourgeois morality and the proletarian morality."

Yet Mr. Pouget deems even this morality too constrictive. For in considering the transfer of industry to the workers from an ethical standpoint, he says:

"We are going to take over the industries some day, for three very good reasons: Because we need them, because we want them, and because we have the power to get them. Whether we are 'ethically justified' or not is not our concern."

Their destructive policies begin with opposition to the trade union. For this they would substitute a type of organization that would unite all the workers into one ardent, compact, awe-inspiring union, eager to sacrifice personal and immediate benefits to a dream of future perfection. Such an organization would constitute a sort of militant flying wedge to reach by direct action the heart of industry—for to the victors belong the spoils. The tactics employed in this "organization" are the general strike, direct action, and sabotage.

The general strike is to enable the workers to approximate the fighting strength of the employer—for action "altogether," with irresistible solidarity, would sweep all difficulties away. The mere fact that different groups of men working at different trades have different interests, presents no difficulties to these theorists who demand that all workers be ever on the *qui vive* to forego their individual desires and welfare and the interests of those dependent on them for the sake of the "altogether" Utopia. Since the "altogether" strike with folded hands for industrial purposes is impracticable because of difficulties presented by human nature, more aggressive methods are employed.

In actual practice it is hard to distinguish between direct action, sabotage, and violence. Direct action, they say, is getting results by more immediate methods—that is, appropriating. The term sabotage is derived from *sabot,* meaning a wooden shoe. The propagandists say sabotage is a slang word used figuratively in the sense "to work clumsily." Less prejudiced writers find a more sinister connotation, derived from the action of French peasants in throwing their wooden shoes into machinery as a strike device. Direct action interpreted means violence, force, sabotage, the strike in which are used all the methods condemned by humanitarian standards—that the ultimate ideal may be obtained immediately. Sabotage is just another term for destruction. The leaders suggest that delicate and expensive machinery may be ruined by careless handling or dropping in foreign articles; food or other articles may be made unfit for sale; salespeople may refuse to show stock, may injure sales by displaying all the defects in the goods or by merely telling the whole truth; expensive mistakes may be made intentionally, as perishable goods billed to the wrong destination. One of their leaders dropped this suggestion:

"With two cents worth of a certain ingredient utilized in a peculiar way it will be easy for the railwaymen to put the locomotives in such a condition as to make it impossible to run them."

The whole purpose of this program is not to secure changes that will bring present benefits to the workers, but to make the employers so dissatisfied, so hopeless, that they will retire in despair, leaving the workers in possession of industry. And then what? Which of them knows? Is it not true that if society is "too individualistic for a socialist State" it is equally "too communistic for an individualist State?"

We would not disparage idealism, but the vision of all the workers of the world, banded together in one world-wide organization against all other forces of society, nations, and States is too chimerical to be seriously entertained by an intelligent man or woman confronted with the practical problem of securing a better home, better food and clothing, and a better life. Intelligent, practical workers want an organization that will benefit them now, and will protect them in the enjoyment of advantages secured while additional benefits are sought. It is well and inspiring to work for the uplift of all humanity, but that usually

can best be done if each will attend to his own immediate obligations so that all may daily grow into better things rather than suddenly be carried skyward by a cataclysmic uplift to strange and unaccustomed heights and duties.

However, the most serious objections to the Industrial Workers of the World are not their utopian theories, but the violence, the "ceaseless class war" without regard to humanitarian rules of war, and the needless suffering inflicted upon the workers and society. It has been said that in advising waiters on strike their leaders called attention to the opportunities in serving food to destroy even life. This has been put into words by one of their spokesmen thus:

> "They do not recognize the employer's right to live any more than a physician recognizes the right of typhoid bacilli to thrive at the expense of a patient, the patient merely keeping alive."

Although the ultimate ideal is individualistic in the extreme, when industry shall be controlled by the groups of workers, when neither State nor laws shall exist, yet the method of attaining this goal sacrifices individual welfare at every stage. The workers are to become pawns to be directed and used by a "live minority" for the ultimate good of all. Present possessions and present benefits are to be lightly cast aside in response to the call of the leaders for immediate, united action for revolutionary purposes. Such methods fail to take human nature and the evolutionary character of progress into account. Both employers and employed who have had experience with the I. W. W. turn with appreciation to the American Federation of Labor.

Then, too, the workers are done a criminal injury and injustice when the I. W. W. comes among them to instill impracticable ideals, so to inflame the imagination by the hallucination that in yet a little while the workers shall inherit the whole earth and all its riches. Deluded by this leadership, unorganized workers who have no conception of hours, fair wages, sanitary or standardized conditions of work; who, since they are unorganized, have been unprotected, domineered over and cruelly treated by employers who take every advantage of their dependent and defenseless position—these toilers have been persuaded to believe that the so-called Industrial Workers of the World will lead raw recruits of labor to immediate, final, and absolute emancipation from every industrial, economic, and social ill; that they will

immediately become the owners of all wealth, the directors of all the means of production and agencies for distribution. Dazed by the anticipated dizzy heights of mastery of world-destinies, intoxicated by the vision of triumph and absolute control, workers have entrusted their welfare to these industrial "promoters" only to come to a realization of the futility of their visions, of blasted hopes and wasted opportunities. Then they turn in wrath upon their deluders and misleaders.

Bitter experience with this organization results in discerning appreciation of the American trade union movement, the American Federation of Labor, as it steadily and surely moves onward, upward, never receding. It is a movement that instills confidence and hope because it is founded upon continual achievements. It does not hold out inflated hopes and impossible ideals which must collapse and disappear before real industrial problems and attacks. The insistent and consistent policy of the trade union movement has secured for the working people whatever of uplift and betterment has made their lives freer and happier. This policy has been one of uncompromising protest and agitation against every form of wrong, injustice, or denial of rights. In the economic field this policy has resulted in effective and triumphant contest. It has inspired workers with the desire, the purpose and the grit to struggle and battle for material improvements in the form of higher wages, fewer hours of labor, better conditions of employment. In the political field the policy has been to avoid alliance with any political party, but to utilize all parties, whenever an opportunity is presented to remedy wrong or inaugurate new and better policies in legislation, administration, or judicature. The American Federation of Labor has always been maintained untrammeled, unrestricted, free to criticize, attack or denounce men, employers, parties, whenever the welfare and the interests of the workers have been menaced. —*American Federationist, July, 1913.*

Mr. Sinclair, disputing the statement that the American Federation of Labor and the railroad brotherhoods speak for the great mass of the working people of the country, asserts:

"There is another organization of workingmen with a large membership—the Industrial Workers of the World. I notice that you do not quote me the opinions of any of its leaders. Yet it is a fact that

the Industrial Workers of the World stands for the interests of a class of workers who are far more numerous than those represented by the American Federation of Labor."

The "large membership" of the "Industrial Workers of the World" is thus described by R. F. Hoxie, Professor of Economics, University of Chicago (*Journal of Political Economy*, November, 1913):

"In spite of eight years of organizing effort and unparalleled advertisement, the official roll of the convention (Chicago, September, 1913) indicated that its present paid-up membership entitled to representation does not much exceed 14,000 men, while the actual constitutional representation on the convention floor was less than half that number. . . . It is admitted by the highest officials of the Industrial Workers that up to the time of the Lawrence strike the membership never reached 10,000, the highest yearly average being but 6,000." . . . "Everywhere the history of the organization has shown this same inability to maintain a stable and growing membership."

Professor Hoxie further says that the "I. W. W." has not been able to organize effectively a body of men equal to 1 per cent. of the American Federation of Labor alone.—*American Federationist, April, 1914, "Upton Sinclair's Mental Marksmanship."*

BOLSHEVISM

My aspirations know no limit for my fellow men, but I do have some,—or at least I am vain enough to believe that I have some common sense and understanding of the operations of the human mind. I am not going to give up voluntarily the labor movement with its achievements of to-day to look for the chimerical to-morrow. I think the greatest, the most radical, the most idealistic and the most fantastical declaration which any body of men has made has been by the Bolsheviki of Russia. And they have lost, not only the meat from the bone but the bone itself, and have not even the shadow. They went out for the maximum for the masses, for land, bread, and peace, and they haven't their land or bread or peace. We prefer to go on in this normal way of trying to make the conditions of life and labor better to-day than they were yesterday; and better to-morrow and to-morrow and to-morrow's to-morrow than each day that has gone before.—*From address at reception to the visiting British Labor Union Delegates, tendered by The National Civic Federation, March 16, 1918.*

The political party which claims to represent French labor has indorsed Bolshevism; strong influences are at work within the Confederation Generale du Travail working in the same direction. The French anti-war fanatics and pro-Bolshevists practically obtained control of the French Socialist Party at the end of last July. At that time and up until the very day of German defeat the slogan was "Peace without victory" and a compromise with German Kaiserism and militarism. At the national congress of the party in October their control was reaffirmed, and the official party organ passed from the hands of the so-called pro-war politician Renaudel into the hands of the anti-war politician Longuet, the grandson of Karl Marx.

In spite of all that the French Socialist Party could do to prevent it, the war was continued until the German defeat, which brought with it the German revolution. Did the socialists then confess their tremendous blunder or wrong? Not in the least. On the contrary, they claimed that Germany was not defeated by the valiant and heroic armies of the world's democracies, but by an impending German revolution, due to the soviet agitation in that country. They took the armistice as a sign of the failure of democratic internationalism and the victory of soviet internationalism.

The armistice had not been signed three days when the executive committee of the French Socialist Party met and passed the following amazing resolutions:

"The French Socialist Party welcomes the German Republic and the taking over of the power in Prussia and the Confederated States by the working class.

"As in the Russia of the Soviets, socialism has appeared in all central Europe as the proper liquidator of the political and social situation left by the war.

"The party thus sees justified the confidence which it has always had in the action of peoples.

"Considering that certain of the conditions of the armistice leave the sharply defined fear that the allied Governments have the intention of further extending the criminal military intervention against revolutionary Russia, the party declares that it will appeal to all the forces of the French proletariat to prevent the socialism which is being born in Russia as well as in Germany and Austria, from being crushed by coalitions of foreign capitalisms.

"The party urges the French working people most rigorously to rally to the support of their unions and socialist groups, to sustain their class journals, and to keep themselves ready to make socialism triumph in France as it has in the other countries of Europe."

This resolution, which betrays not only France but also the democratic league of nations now in process of formation at Versailles is as remarkable for what it says as what it omits to say. The only revolution it recognizes in Russia is the counter revolution by which the Bolshevists overthrew the democratic government of Kerensky and by force of arms dissolved the constitutional assembly. It is assumed that the new government of Germany will be of a similar character and it is demanded that the socialist minority representing less than 25 per cent. of the French people should bring about a soviet revolution in France.

All the achievements of the democratic revolutions of the past in France, America and England are ignored or perverted. It is held that there is precisely the same need for revolutions in those countries as there was in Russia and in Germany when the Czar and Kaiser were thrown out. There never was such a thing as a Declaration of Independence or a French declaration of the rights of man. The universal suffrage of France, England and the United States is ignored as if it had never existed. The growing power of labor in America, as well as in France and England, is implicitly denied. The assumption is that labor and the masses generally are in the same position in the world's great democracies to-day as they were under the Kaiser and the Czar.

If this is not treason to democracy and treason to internationalism, then we would better take the word "treason" out of the dictionary.—*From testimony at hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, January 3 and 4, 1919.*

I do not know that I am entitled to very great credit because I am not a Bolshevik. With my understanding of American institutions and American opportunities, I repeat that the man who would not be a patriot in defense of the institutions of our country would be undeserving the privilege of living in this country. . . . If I thought that Bolshevism was the right road to go, that it meant freedom, justice and the principles of humane society and living conditions, I would join the Bolsheviki. *It is because I know that the whole scheme leads to nowhere, that it is destructive in its efforts and in its every activity, that it compels reaction and brings about a situation worse than the*

one it has undertaken to displace, that I oppose and fight it.—From "Our Shield Against Bolshevism," McClure's Magazine, April, 1919.

The movement of destruction is abroad in the world to-day. The philosophy of despair has its fanatic adherents. The lean body has furnished many a weak mind as prey to teachings of reaction masked under a pretense of progress. Those who see wisely into the future must, if society is to be saved from fires more consuming than those we have known, so shape the course of the world as to offer this hideous wraith of destruction no foothold. The lean body has a right to the opportunity to get food. If it is denied that right it is fair sport for the teacher of ruin. If it is denied that fundamental right it will sooner or later furnish a weak mind likely to fall prey to whatsoever may come promising relief, no matter how unsound or impossible may be that promise.

Russia stands before our gaze like a flaming torch of warning. A thing called Bolshevism has reared its ugly head in that sad and sorry land. Bolshevism is a theory, the chief tenet of which is the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Leaving out of consideration for the moment the story of murder and devastation that has marched with this theory into practice, we must set down the theory itself as abhorrent to a world that loves democracy. We shall progress by the use of the machinery of democracy, or we shall not progress. There is no group of men on earth fit to dictate to the rest of the world. It is this central idea of Bolshevism that makes the whole of it outcast in the minds of sane men. It is this focusing point of it all that makes it an enemy to our civilization.

This idea—the central theory of Bolshevism—is not in the minds of the people of Russia. This we know as surely as we know any fact that comes to us through human channels. But this theory has been imposed upon a mass in which there is acute hunger, in which there is disorganization, in which there is no strong, normal soul or body left to combat evil immediately and effectively.

Were there an American Federation of Labor in Russia there could have been no Bolshevism. Were there no organized labor movement in America devoted to the ideals of liberty and right

and justice and unshaken in its faith in progress through the orderly processes of democracy, there would be Bolshevism in America. If there should be in America any great denial of the just aspirations of the working people as voiced by their organized movement there would be a dangerous flow toward Bolshevism that would be neither pleasant nor helpful for America.—*From "The Battle Line of Labor," McClure's Magazine, May 1919.*

VIII

LABOR IN THE WAR FOR DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY

PATRIOTISM—TRUE AND FALSE

We do not oppose the development of our industry, the expansion of our commerce, or the power and influence which the United States may exert upon the destinies of the nations of the earth. On the contrary, we realize that the higher intelligence and standard of the life of the American workers will largely contribute towards attaining the highest pinnacle of industrial and commercial greatness; and these achievements in the paths of peace will glorify the institutions of our republic, to which the grateful eyes and the yearning hearts of the people of the earth will turn for courage and inspiration to struggle onward and upward, so that the principles of human liberty and human justice may be implanted in their own lands.

America, and particularly American institutions, are not only worthy of our love and veneration because they give us greater freedom than those of any other nation, but the institutions of the United States represent a principle—the great principle of self-government of the people, for the people, by the people—self-restraint as well as great power. This principle we shall only prove ourselves worthy of representing, and holding forth as an inspiration for the peoples of other nations to emulate and seek to establish by manifesting restraint upon ourselves or upon those who would thrust us out of our physical, moral, progressive and powerful sphere into the vortex of imperialism, with all the evils which that term implies—militarism, despotism, and venality on the one hand; slavery, misery and despair on the other.

The flag of our republic should float over a free people, and must never form a cloak to hide slavery, barbarism, despotism,

or tyranny. America, as we know it, with its blessings of peace and stability, must not be hazarded for a new era.

The possessors of the wealth of our country enjoy liberty and freedom, no matter where they may be or wherever they may go. It has always been the hewers of wood and the carriers of water, the wealth producers, whose mission it has been not only to struggle for freedom, but to be ever vigilant to maintain the liberty or freedom achieved; and it behooves the representatives of the grand army of labor, in convention assembled, to give vent to the alarm we feel from the dangers threatening us and our entire people, to enter our solemn and emphatic protest against what we already feel, that with the success of the policy of imperialism the decadence of our republic will have already set in.

"Forever in thine eyes, O Liberty,
Shines that bright light
By which the world is saved;
And tho' they slay us,
We shall trust in thee."

—From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Kansas City, December, 1898.

Throughout the length and breadth of our country, from city, town, village, and hamlet there are no more patriotic men and women than those who belong to the ranks of labor. I respectfully dissent from the insinuations, much more the charge, that organized labor, the men of the greater intelligence among the working people of our country, the men who have manifested greater interest in themselves and in their fellows by the very fact of their organizing, that for that reason they lack patriotism.

In truth, the history of our national struggles bears evidence to the fact that out of the ranks of organized labor have come the men who have made up the army of our country in defense of our flag, in defense of our homes, in defense of our honor and our interests, in defense of the principles for which our government stands.—*From address at Boston Convention of A. F. of L., December, 1903.*

We do not wish to dwarf the wonderful heroism of our great soldiers or sailors; we sing their glory whenever opportunity affords; but we do not believe that the men who fall upon the

martial battlefield shall be regarded as the only heroes of the world, and that the men who fall upon the battlefield of labor shall be regarded as the hoboes of the world.

It is not enough alone to know how to die; it is better to know how to live. Men in the spirit of enthusiasm or anger may throw themselves upon their antagonists and meet death fearlessly; but the men who work and struggle, who in their cool moments calmly and deliberately enter into contests that may mean months and months of slow deprivation and almost starvation, to their heroism is due a greater tribute.—*From address at meeting of Plate Printers Union No. 2, Washington, D. C., January 21, 1905.*

To-day we urge that it requires more heroism in men and women to bear the brunt of great sacrifice, of quiet, silent suffering for the betterment of the human family than is manifested upon the gory field of battle. To endeavor to help, to uplift, to benefit our fellows, to make the burdens of life less onerous and to help bear our brother's burdens, to make life brighter and better, to permit the ray of sunshine to enter into the home and to dispel the gloom, to make man stronger and nobler and woman more happy and beautiful and childhood more expectant of a brighter and better day, is the great uplifting work, is the work of this century which you, the toilers, and the intelligent and sympathetic men and women are effecting with a heroism and by a splendid work that may not be understood or appreciated in our time, but as we sing the glories of the men who have won for us the great attributes and opportunities of freedom in our time, so those who follow us will realize that in our day in the same measure that we perform our duties to our fellows, we shall have performed the great work for the social uplift and universal peace.—*From address at Labor Mass Meeting, Cooper-Union, New York City, April 16, 1907, in connection with International Peace Congress.*

One of the strongest impulses in man is patriotism. This instinct was ignored by internationalism. Yet it is the instinct that has ever inspired men to make great and heroic sacrifices—to give up interests, possessions, dear ones, and even life itself. Patriotism lifts men above the level of expediency, safety, and

profits. War is awful but patriotism will dare even war. The man who has thought only for his personal safety and welfare may be useful but he is not inspiring. But the man or the woman who gives ungrudgingly, with glorious disregard of self, is an inspiration that brings us close to the beauty and the purpose of life, and makes luminous the ideal—"He lives most who gives most."—*American Federationist, November, 1914.*

When the political genius of the nations provides representative machinery for dealing with international relations, diplomacy will catch step with democratic ideals of freedom and justice. But any plan which purposes merely to deny nations the right to use force will fail. Force can not be eliminated, but it should be under the control of intelligent, responsible, democratically controlled agents of justice. Organized responsible force will make treaties something more than scraps of paper. International peace will follow international justice—not disarmament and proscription of war. . . . However, let no one be deluded into thinking that international political organization will supplant the national state. The present war has proved that one of the strongest emotions in men is patriotism. Patriotism is a strong compelling force—a primal instinct in the individual. It was stronger than the fundamental tenet of socialism, stronger than ideals of international peace, stronger than religion, stronger than love of life and family. . . . With the passing of delusions upon which men have builded, comes the necessity of revising theories and methods. This European cataclysm has subjected theories and ideals to the test of steel and fire. It has brought out new values. It has demonstrated clearly that a sentiment in favor of international peace is alone unable to maintain peace. It has proved that patriotism is a stronger tie than class interests—and so demonstrated a fallacy of socialist theory. . . . Our efforts to maintain peace must be directed toward removing the causes of war. International peace will result only from international agencies for establishing justice, possessing power to enforce its decisions. Peace at any cost is advocated by only sentimentalists and neurotic dreamers. The best guarantee of peace to any self-respecting independent nation is the power of self-protection. . . . The organizations of the working men were the last to sever the ties that bound them

to their fellows in warring nations. But even the workers put patriotism above fraternalism. . . . The workers better than all others realize that no one can make them free and that they themselves must achieve freedom. They know that international politics can be freed from the pernicious influences that have been manipulating them to save personal interests only by the effective organized protests of those who have suffered from unscrupulous, treacherous diplomacy. When the people of the various nations demand the establishment of representative agencies authorized and competent to secure international justice, then international wars will cease.—*From Article in Harper's Weekly, March 10, 1915.*

You have done me an honor by saying it is due in whole or in part to the influence which I exercised upon my fellows, that there was such loyal continuous service during the war. That may in part be true, but if it be true, it is because the men of labor in America have come to look upon our Republic with a more reverential vision than ever before. And because in the labor movement in America we have not gone after false gods. In the labor movement in America we have not allowed the political parties, no matter how altruistic they may proclaim themselves to be, to dominate or influence our movement, not any Republican Party, not any Democratic Party, not any Socialist Party, or any Prohibition Party, or any Labor Party. We have stood as a movement of America's workers, believing that under the institutions of our Republic we have the lawful right to organize, to strive for a better life, to work out our own salvation to the last opportunity, otherwise that we could quit work and try to impose justice into the consideration of the mind of the employer.

Now, when the war came on, can you imagine, gentlemen, what might have happened in the United States if the war had occurred about seven or eight or nine years ago, when the country was rampant with indignation by reason of the injunctions which were issued wholly without any warrant of law? When men of honor and character were haled before the courts, put upon their trial, and sentenced to imprisonment as if they were common felons? If we had been in the war at that time, when men's influence was gone and whatever bit of reputation which

they had, for which they had worked and had hoped to maintain was sought to be taken from them; when all honor was besmirched; when men who had no other hope in life but to serve their fellows were addressed by judges in language which could only apply to the most consummate scoundrels and brutes; when men with families, men who were husbands, fathers, grandfathers, were addressed in terms, direct terms, as if the judges had before them men who had raped womanhood—gentlemen, if we had been in the war during that period, there might have been a different story to tell. . . . I could understand the bitterness the people of England and Continental Europe have against each other, the governments and dynasties. In turn they have all been wrong toward each other. They have in turn played the freebooter and the pirate against each other. No matter how much the democratic countries have changed in Europe, that fact to which I have just now referred is part of the history of those countries and the flags of these respective countries engaged in battle array during this war, meant something of bitterness and hatred toward each other. But there is not any people in all the world who do not respect the history and the flag of the United States of America. It has meant to them, as long as they can remember, a republic, and will remain to them so long as they can associate the flag of our country, the idea of justice and of freedom and of opportunity and of hope. My judgment was and is that a people could not fight so valiantly and heroically under the banner of a monarchical institution with the same valor and the same heroism and the same abandonment against the people carrying the flag of the Republic of the United States. That in itself was a blow to the morale of the militarist fighting machine of Germany.—*From testimony at hearing before Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, January 3 and 4, 1919.*

We should bear in mind this further fact, that all of the fighting men who could answer to the call to arms, whether two millions or five millions or more, would have been of no avail whatsoever if it had not been for the civilian fighting man in factory, workshop and shipyard. It is the heroism of industry, it is the heroism of a consciousness that very few people outside the ranks of labor can understand or appreciate. For there does

not seem to be heroism or glory in bending one's back to a machine or to a task to be begrimed, to be exhausted with labor, to have the poison of fatigue infected into one's whole system—there is not much glory in it. I went down in the ships to see the men in the stokeholes. There was no glory in that, but there was heroism. There was no chance for them if their ships were attacked. They would be either scalded to death by the steam or burned to death by the fire of their furnaces, or sent to a watery grave. There was not a fighting chance with them. Theirs was a resignation grim with determination that the job had to be done, and they were going to do it.—*From address at Labor Victory Meeting, New York City, December 1, 1918.*

There are no citizens of our country who are more truly patriotic than the organized wage-earners—or all of the wage-earners—and we have done our share in the civic life of the nation as well as in the nation's wars. We have done our share to protect the nation against insidious attacks from within that were directed at the very heart of our national life and would have inevitably involved us in foreign complications. The wage-earners stood unfalteringly for ideals of honor, freedom, and loyalty. Their wisdom and their patriotism served our country in a time of great need. No one can question that the wage-earners of the United States are patriotic in the truest sense. No one can question their willingness to fight for the cause of liberty, freedom, and justice. No one can question the value of the ideals that direct the labor movement.—*From address at annual meeting of The National Civic Federation, in Washington, D. C., January 18, 1916.*

America is not merely a name, a land, a country, a continent; America is a symbol. It is an ideal, the hope of the world.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand by his country in times of stress and war as well as during times of peace. The man who would not fight, or make the supreme sacrifice, if necessary, to save and protect his home and his country, who would not fight for liberty, is undeserving and unworthy of living in a free country.—*From "Our Shield Against Bolshevism," McClure's Magazine, April, 1919.*

The loyalty of American labor during the war was a matter of world interest, a matter commented upon in all circles wherever men met over the world to discuss the fate of civilization and how best to protect its institutions against devastation at the hands of the enemy arms.

This loyalty was inherent in American labor. American labor lives close to the heart of the things that go to make the material side of what we speak of as democracy. Living thus close to the hard facts of it they understand the soul of it and breathe in communion with the very life of it. American labor is of the very stuff of democracy, because the life of the movement is close to the work of democracy, held there constantly by the paramount fact that work and body and soul are inseparable phases of the same life. . . . The war did not compel us to make any change in our course. What the war did was to lay before us the necessity of putting our every ounce of strength and energy into the work of safeguarding what we had so long striven for. Our movement went on in the same direction. The war opened before us as a majestic, climactic episode on the road to the fulfillment of a great historic mission.—*From "The Battle Line of Labor," McClure's Magazine, May, 1919.*

LABOR'S BOND OF FRATERNALISM

It has ever been the purpose, as well as the mission, of the A. F. of L. to not only cultivate the most fraternal relations with the organized wage-workers of all countries, but also to take advantage of every opportunity to make these purposes and relations an actuality. . . . It should be the constant aim of our national and international trade unions to endeavor to bring about a mutual recognition, or, better still, an interchange of cards between them and the unions of the same trade or calling in other countries. This principle is already in vogue in several of our affiliated unions, but I would recommend that it be adopted by all. Such a system once fully in operation, its beneficial results will soon be manifest.

It will pave the way for the attainment of that end for which reformers struggle and of which poets sing; a federation of the people of the world.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Philadelphia, December, 1892.*

With the view of a closer bond of sympathy and unity among the organized workers of the different countries, correspondence with many of them has been maintained, and entered into with a number of others. We should endeavor by every means within our power to cultivate fraternal feeling and interest in the welfare of the wage-earners of all countries, to aid and encourage every movement calculated to materially, morally, and socially improve the conditions of the workers, no matter where they may be located, and particularly to lend that aid which may be in our power to those who show a disposition to stand upon the common polity of our movement.

From the officers of our affiliated unions come the satisfactory reports that they are in closer touch with their fellow trade unionists everywhere; and it is additionally gratifying that the mutual recognition, exchange, and acceptance of union cards is being adopted internationally.

With each step taken in the direction of cementing the bond of fraternity and recognition of the principle of solidarity in the international labor movement, we shall not only help to bear each other's burdens, but continually make those burdens lighter, and be the lever for that international brotherhood of man when the wars of nations shall be a thing of the past.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Kansas City, December, 1898.*

Thinking and liberty-loving and peace-loving men the world over have been keenly and painfully disappointed at the meager results of the conference at The Hague in the interests of international peace. Mankind has a right to expect something of a more tangible character tending toward the abolition of international slaughter. The toilers, the world over, are primarily interested in averting conflict, for they form the mass of men who fall in battle or who bear the burdens which war entails.

International peace is usually disturbed by those having a sordid purpose. The uplifting work of progress and civilization is interrupted and retarded when international peace is disturbed. Long periods elapse after a war before the constructive work in the interests of humanity and civilization can be resumed.

Despite the failure of the congress to fulfill the expectations of the peace and humanity-loving men of the world, the duty devolves upon the organized labor movement of all civilized coun-

tries to carry on an educational propaganda that shall reach the conscience and the hearts of mankind.

Labor will strive to persuade the governments of the world to establish universal, international peace, but lest these hopes be unrealized and efforts prove futile it must never be forgotten that in the last analysis the masses of the people of every country have it in their hands to exert their own giant will and power against international war, and that if otherwise thwarted they will not hesitate to exert it.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Norfolk, Va., November, 1907.*

Of all the people who suffer from war, the toilers are most intensely interested. They are the great burden bearers of its resultant horrors and sufferings. It is therefore not difficult to discern why they have from their first gatherings, and at almost every gathering thereafter, committed themselves unalterably and vitally to the abolition of war, and, through a duly constituted international court of arbitration, the adjudication of all international contentions which can not be settled through the ordinary channels of conciliation and diplomacy. . . .

Instead of the enormous expenditure for arsenals and armories, battleships and navy yards, we would have them devoted to schoolrooms, colleges, and universities; to university extensions, manual training and technology; to make parks and playgrounds, air spaces, breathing places; to weed out misery and poverty, and stamp out their ill-begotten child, the great white plague, which is ravaging so many of the masses of our people. We would have our people taught the arts and sciences, to be of service, to teach them love and good will, the love of the good, the true, the beautiful, and the useful.

> Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
> Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
> Given to redeem the human mind from error,
> There were no need of arsenals and forts.

While it may not be a practical proposition to ask for immediate disarmament of all countries, the time and the intelligence of our people surely demand that the extraordinary increase in the armed naval and military forces be limited and restricted rather than expanded and extended. We can not continue to increase the enormous burden and expense. We must call a halt

some time. Why not now?—*From address at National Civic Federation Conference, January 12, 1911.*

The advice, "Workingmen of all countries, unite!" can not be carried into actual practice to the extent of similarity of organization and procedure. In trade unionism, the possibilities are promising for internationality in respect to recognition of union membership, in refraining from black-legging, and in financial and other support in case of great strikes and lockouts. But politically, no two countries are on the same plane. There may be a general sentiment favoring the emancipation of labor everywhere from its disqualifications, an agreement upon many points in an analysis of the injustices of society as now organized, and even common assent as to certain principles or maxims for guidance in forming the better society that is coming, but to fix hard and fast rules by which the wage-earners in all countries are to work in building for the future is an impossibility.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlanta, Ga., November, 1911.*

With the political issues and political factions of Mexico the American labor movement has no vital concern, but it has a deep abiding interest in the growth and progress of the cause of labor in Mexico, and it desires to do all that can be done in a spirit of fraternity and coöperation. The American labor movement recognizes that in the organization of the Mexican workers there lies an element of great hope, for there is a force that has power to shape a great future for a people capable of conceiving great ideas and an understanding of the possibilities which human life can attain when given opportunities and freedom.—*American Federationist, July, 1916.*

From the very beginning of our efforts to promote this Pan-American Federation of Labor one fundamental principle must be thoroughly understood. We, in the United States, concede to Mexico and the people of Mexico the right to work out their own problems according to their own ideals and in accord with their needs and the conditions that exist. We must insist upon the same right for the United States. The American trade union movement must have the sole right to determine the affairs of

the American trade union movement. Just as it will be party to no movement to enforce American thought and American institutions upon other peoples, so it can not permit the theories of any other American country to dominate, minimize or change the principles of the American labor movement. . . .

The jurisdiction of a Pan-American Federation of Labor would properly be to enable the workers of the various countries so to direct affairs that no one of them would be used against the interests of others, to promote certain fundamental principles of common action and their universal application, such as standards of work and life, hours and conditions of labor and minimum wage established not by law but by economic action, to take advantage of time and opportunity to cultivate the best relations between the national labor movements of the various countries, and to work out in the interests of the common good those matters upon which there is unanimous agreement. . . .

The economic movement and other activities [in Mexico] have not yet been fully differentiated from the revolutionary movement. The whole is an effort to express the desires and the ideals of the people. The labor movement has adopted many forms and practices that will be modified later under conditions of peace and in the practical constructive work of the movement. There are some undesirable characteristics, but the labor movement as it now exists in Mexico represents the best that they can do under the circumstances. It is the first efforts of a people, many of whom were recently slaves or peons, to work out their freedom economically as well as politically. . . .

There is great hope in this effort to bring about a Pan-American Federation of Labor—a hope that is based upon the helpfulness of the organized labor movements of Mexico and the United States in helping to avert war between the two countries. The labor movement succeeded in doing what other organizations desired to do and hoped to do. . . . When, therefore, two great fundamental organisms in two countries which were threatened by war sent their representatives to a conference to discuss the mutual interests of the masses of the two nations concerned, there was a conference of delegates authorized to speak in the name of the masses of both countries—a conference that resulted in brushing aside non-essentials and fictions that had been created for prejudicing the minds of both nations and misinforming

them in order that they might be more willing to clash in war. For the first time the desires and the ideals of the masses of the two nations were given an opportunity for expression in a great international crisis.—*American Federationist, August, 1916.*

Now that the danger of autocracy has passed, it behooves you men of America and of the Pan-American countries to organize more thoroughly for peace. The forces of war and conquest and exploitation have had their full organization; now we must more thoroughly organize that the voice of the peace-loving shall become the dominant word of our every day lives. The peace-loving, justice-loving peoples of the world must not again be taken by surprise as they were in August, 1914. The American labor movement hopes to bring about the best possible fraternal coöperative and sympathetic action among the working people of all the Pan-American countries.—*From Address to Mexican and American Labor Conferees, at Laredo, Texas, November 13, 1918.*

TWENTY YEARS AGO

The workers are not less, but perhaps more patriotic than all others, yet they abhor war for mere war's sake. If the honor of our country has been insulted, if the interests of our people are assailed, if the lives of our men are wantonly or maliciously destroyed, none will be more ready to respond to a call to redress the wrongs and punish the evil-doers than the united wage-earners of our country, but no spirit of jingoism or false sentimentality will move them from their well-grounded position that in any war labor must not only furnish the men to do the fighting, to be killed and maimed, but to have the suffering widows' and orphans' hearts bleeding, and the toilers thereafter to bear the burdens of taxation resulting from such a catastrophe.—*American Federationist, March, 1898.*

For years the brave Cubans struggled and made sacrifices to attain liberty and independence from Spanish domination. Among the earliest sympathizers and coöperators with that cause was the American Federation of Labor. And, at every convention thereafter, this sentiment was reiterated and emphasized,

and at gatherings of labor in every city and town of the country resolutions declaratory of the same sentiments were adopted.

At its session at Cincinnati, 1896, the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor in convention assembled, hereby tenders its hearty sympathy to all men struggling against oppression, and especially to the men of Cuba, who for years have sacrificed and suffered to secure the right of self-government.

"Resolved, That the example of the people of France, in giving recognition and aid to the Fathers in their struggle to secure the independence of the colonies, is worthy of imitation; and we hereby call upon the President and Congress to recognize the belligerent rights of the Cuban revolutionists."

The important events resulting therefrom are, in a great measure, our concern.

The tyranny of Spain, her misrule, her corrupting influences over the Cuban people and the impoverishment of her sons, at last quickened the sympathies and the consciences of American manhood. Many efforts were made by our Government to secure Cuba's deliverance from her bondmaster. The pleadings of our people were evidently regarded by the Spanish government as of a platonic character, or that we were unwilling to bear the logical result of our humanitarian interest in the people of that superb isle of the Antilles. Perhaps she took our pleadings as manifestations of weakness or vacillation. She has found to her sorrow that we were as good as our word; and perhaps never in the history of mankind was a war begun on so high a plane of honor and humanity, or calculated to be of so great an advantage to the onward march of civilization.

From the ranks of labor came the quarter of a million of men who volunteered to sacrifice their lives upon the altar of their country in so great a cause. Who, then, but the representatives of labor have the better right to consider the very grave questions which have resulted from our war with Spain?

It was with feelings of exultation that we read of the heroic men in the field, and in the ships—the brave members of the machinists' union who accompanied Hobson on his perilous voyage to danger and almost certain death; of the union boiler maker who, in the midst of battle, gave up his life while repairing an injured boiler; of the men who fed the flames in the furnaces, knowing the perils which awaited them, yet unbuoyed by

the excitement of the storm of shot and shell without; of the stout-hearted men who carried the guns and who were behind the guns; the men in the fever-stricken trenches of Santiago and San Juan. The brave toilers of America have covered themselves and posterity with glory, which so long as liberty shall be a word with some meaning in the vocabulary of the language of our country, will emblazon the pages of history in letters of gold, and be hailed with delight in ages untold.

All through the perils of the war, the American heart beat as one in hope for victory; and, in the hour of our matchless triumph, our pride and gratitude knew no bounds that so great a contest was ended in so brief a period, and that not only might but the right has won.

Out of the war have grown questions of the most serious moment to our people generally, and of direct interest to the wage-workers particularly.

Is it not strange that, after entering upon a war with Spain to obtain the freedom and independence of Cuba, now that victory has been achieved, the question of Cuban independence is often scouted? Our people were ardent and honest in advocacy of Cuban freedom, and are impatient at any attempt to juggle with the question. When the people of Cuba desire annexation to our country it is time to discuss the subject; and in the meantime the fruits of the victory for which they have striven so long and so valiantly, and for which we went to war to aid them to achieve, must not be ruthlessly taken from them.

The assurance given by the President regarding our duty toward Cuba, and that freedom and independence should be accorded its people at the earliest possible moment consistent with safety and assured success, will have an important bearing upon the solution of this question, and portends the success of the primary mission for which the war with Spain was undertaken.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Kansas City, November, 1898.*

PACIFISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

True to the highest and best conception of human life the trade union movement, from its first inception, has been opposed to war. It recognizes that though others may fall, the brunt of war

is borne by the working people; not only upon the battlefield itself, but the burdens thereafter which war entails. We can not be indifferent to, restrain our feeling of horror at, nor withhold our sympathies from, the slaughtered thousands of human beings, even in the far East, regardless of the country toward which our predilections lie.

International wars have become so destructive of human life and property that the world is shocked from center to circumference at the holocausts now witnessed in battle. While it may not be a practical proposition to ask for immediate disarmament of all countries, the time and the intelligence of our peoples surely demand that the extraordinary increase in the armed naval and military forces be limited and restricted rather than expanded and extended. We welcomed the establishment of the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague. May we not entertain the hope that its benign influences may be extended and make for universal peace? We recognize that in the last analysis, and in order to prevent any reaction that may lead to greater and more repeated wars and bloodshed, the success for international peace by arbitration must come from higher intelligence and a better conception of the sacredness of human life. Out of these well-springs will flow that kindred and humane spirit that will recognize the best maintenance of our own rights by conserving the rights of others. In the broad domain of human activity there is no force so potent and which will be so powerful to establish and maintain international peace and human brotherhood as the fraternization of the workers of the world in the international labor movement.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, San Francisco, November, 1904.*

You can not hope to secure international peace by the disarmament of any one of the peoples of the world. I doubt that there is a single thinking American who would advocate in present conditions, that the American people and the American government should decide upon the policy of disarmament. We can't do it, my friends. For one country to disarm to-day when the world is an armed camp outside, would mean that that country would be wiped off the face of the map. We won't do that and I shall not even discuss general disarmament now. We hope by the great pressure of the public conscience of the American

people to so impress it upon the Government of the United States that in turn it will give most explicit instructions to the representatives of the next Hague conference that at least, if they can not agree upon general or gradual disarmament, that this constant burden of expansion and growth of armaments shall be arrested. —*From address at Labor Mass Meeting, Cooper-Union, New York City, April 16, 1907, in connection with International Peace Congress.*

If the inquiry were directed to what I pointed out, that is, the efforts to corruptly induce labor men to call strikes among longshoremen and seamen, it would be fruitful of results. For several months, at times I could scarcely avoid having people try to come in contact with me upon the scheme to call strikes which would affect the situation regarding the handling of products intended for European countries. In my opinion a diligent inquiry should be made into this entire matter. Without regard to any sympathy for the one or the other of the nations involved in the war, had it not been for the honesty of the men at the head of some of these organizations primarily in interest, there would have been great strikes inaugurated at the instance of the agents of foreign governments. All my life I have tried and will continue to try to secure the very best possible conditions of wages and hours for the workers of our country. If these cannot be accomplished without strikes, I have no hesitancy in encouraging strikes for their attainment, but such strikes will have to be undertaken for these specific direct purposes and not for any ulterior purposes, and an improper purpose, and particularly when undertaken by corrupt or other means in the interests of one nation as against the interests of another. Ours is an American labor movement, and will be conducted by the rank and file and the officers of the American labor movement. . . .

When the time shall arrive and further disclosures are necessary, the people will learn with astonishment what has already taken place, and the obligations which all owe to the representatives of labor and what great temptations they have been honest and patriotic enough to resist in the effort to maintain first a strict neutrality in the present European war, and also to insist that the American labor movement shall be conducted by

the rank and file of that movement of our country free from corrupting and contaminating influences of representatives of foreign nations.—*From press interview, August, 1915.*

It is not an unbeautiful theory that has been dissipated by the shot and the smoke of the European war. There were many who held that an organized society was possible upon a basis of the brotherhood of man, in which all had regard for the rights of others and would subordinate their selfish interests to the welfare of others. This ideal made paramount the sanctity of human life and regarded war as a relic of barbarism possible only because institutions of justice had not been sufficiently developed. Wage-earners generally of all civilized countries proclaimed and indorsed this ideal and declared that they would use every means within their power to prevent war even to the extent of stopping all of the industries of the nations through a general strike. There were many extreme pacifists who could find no justification for war or for the use of force in international affairs.

And I, too, found this ideal attractive. In a speech made in April, 1899, in Tremont Temple, Boston, I said:

"The organized wage-worker learns from his craft association the value of humanity and of the brotherhood of man, hence it is not strange that we should believe in peace, not only nationally, but internationally. It is often our custom to send organizers from one country to another for the purpose of showing to our fellows in other countries the value of our association in the labor movement. If international peace can not be secured by the intelligence of those in authority, then I look forward to the time when the workers will settle this question—by the dock laborers refusing to handle goods that are to be used to destroy their fellow men, and by the seamen of the world, united in one organization, while willing to risk their lives in conducting the commerce of nations, absolutely refusing to strike down their fellow-men."

My belief that war was no longer possible was based upon what I desired rather than upon realities because I felt so keenly the brutality, the destruction, and the waste of war. It seemed to me that war and conditions of war cut through the veneer of civilization and disclosed the brute in man. The consequence and the purpose of war accustom man to treat human life lightly. They make men callous to human suffering and they idealize force. No one can hear of the atrocities of the terrible carnage of the present war, of the destruction on the battlefields and on

the high seas without a feeling of horror that civilized men can plan such methods, can use the skill of their minds and bodies and the wisdom of past generations to such terrible purpose. But what if these horrors done to the bodies of men shall prevent greater horrors to the minds—the souls of men?

The pacifists and those who hold to policies of non-resistance have failed as I had failed to understand and to evaluate that quality in the human race which makes men willing to risk their all for an ideal. Men worthy of the name will fight even for a "scrap of paper" when that paper represents ideals of human justice and freedom. The man who would not fight for such a scrap of paper is a poor craven who dares not assert his rights against the opposition and the demands of others. There is little progress made in the affairs of the world in which resistance of others is not involved. Not only must man have a keen sense of his own rights, but the will and the ability to maintain those rights with effective insistence. Resistance to injustice and tyranny and low ideals is inseparable from a virile fighting quality that has given purpose and force to ennobling causes in all nations.

Though we may realize the brutality of war, though we may know the value of life, yet we know equally well what would be the effects upon the lives and the minds of men who would lose their rights, who would accept denial of justice rather than hazard their physical safety. The progress of all the ages has come as the result of protests against wrongs and existing conditions and through assertion of rights and effective demands for justice. Our own freedom and republican form of government have been achieved by resistance to tyranny and insistence upon rights. Freedom and democracy dare not be synonymous with weakness. They exist only because there is a vision of the possibilities of human life, faith in human nature, and the will to make these things realities even against the opposition of those who see and understand less deeply.

The people who are willing to maintain their rights and to defend their freedom are worthy of those privileges. Rights carry with them obligation—duty. It is the duty of those who live under free institutions at least to maintain them unimpaired. —*From address at annual meeting of The National Civic Federation in Washington, D. C., January 18, 1916.*

Though we may realize the brutality of war, though we may know the value of life, yet we know equally well what would be the effects upon the lives and the minds of men who would lose their rights, who would accept denial of justice rather than hazard their physical safety. The progress of all the ages has come as the result of protests against wrongs and cruel conditions and through assertion of rights and effective demands for justice. Our own freedom and republican form of government have been achieved by resistance to tyranny and insistence upon rights. Freedom and democracy dare not be synonymous with weakness. They exist only because there is a vision of the possibilities of human life, faith in human nature and the will to make these things realities even against the opposition of those who see and understand less truly.—*American Federationist, March, 1916.*

I am free to say that in our international relations I was an ultra-pacifist until the breaking out of this war. I was willing to go the limit to stop war or prevent war. But when I found that the people responded to their colors, whether for kaiser, czar, president or king, I made up my mind that I have been living in a fool's paradise, and that after all it is necessary for men to be prepared to defend themselves.—*From address before Wilson Eight-Hour League, Washington, D. C., October 13, 1916.*

As you know the most insidious influences are at work not only to create a pro-Kaiser propaganda but also to divide and alienate from one another the nations and peoples fighting for the freedom and democracy of the world. It is your duty as it is the duty of all to impress upon all labor organizations of European neutral countries the truth about the pretended international socialist congress called to be held at Stockholm. It should be emphasized that it does not represent the working class of America, England, France or Belgium, but was called by the German socialists and certain other notoriously pro-German agitators in other countries either to bring about a Kaiser-dictated peace under the deceptive catch-phrase "no annexations, no indemnities," or in the hope of deceiving the Russian socialists into betraying the great western democracies into consenting to a

separate peace. It was for the above reasons I cabled yesterday direct to the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies at Petrograd.—*Cablegrams, May 8, 1917, to Jouhaux, Secretaire, Confederation Générale du Travail, Paris, France; Louis Dubreuilh, Secretaire, Parti-Socialiste, Paris, France; G. J. Wardle, M. P., Chairman, The British Labor Party, London, England.*

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor in session after due deliberation upon invitation received from you and from Oudegeest of Amsterdam, Holland, to send delegates to a conference proposed to be held at Stockholm September seventeen, decided that we regard all such conferences as premature and untimely and can lead to no good purpose. We apprehend that a conference such as is contemplated would rather place obstacles in the way to democratize the institutions of the world and hazard the liberties and opportunities for freedom of all peoples. Therefore, the American Federation of Labor with its two million five hundred thousand members cannot accept invitation to participate in such a conference. If an international trade union conference is to be held it should be at a more opportune time than the present or the immediate future, and in any event the proposals of the American Federation of Labor for international conference should receive further and more sympathetic consideration. Shall be glad to continue correspondence.—*From message to President Lindquist, Stockholm Conference, June 27, 1917.*

There are some people who have in their minds the thought that, after all, our Government was not neutral. I refer to the charge which has been made that the United States and her people furnished some of the countries at war with arms and ammunition and foods, etc., and that these acts were acts in conflict with the principles of neutrality. Let me say this, that the Government of the United States up to the time of our entrance into the war did not side with any of the contending countries. The people of the United States were engaged in the manufacture and production of certain articles, which, under the laws of the country and under the laws of the world, were perfectly lawful productions. They had the right to sell them to any one who came to the United States and desired to buy.

The American producer and manufacturer sold to those who wanted to buy a lawful product. Now, if one or two of the countries could not buy these products and could not take them to their own homes, that was not the fault of the United States. And let me say in connection with this, that no country now contending in the war repeats that charge against the United States or attempts now to argue that the United States was unneutral because it sold its products to those who wanted to buy.

But in addition, during the Spanish-American War the manufacturers of arms and munitions in Germany sold these products to Spain, as well as to the United States. During the Boer War —a war in which my sympathies went with the Boers—Germany as well as other countries sold munitions to the Boers, as well as they did to England. During our Civil War the countries of Europe furnished munitions and supplies to the Southern Confederacy, as well as to the Federal Government.

No one, no nation ever before attempted to cast a reflection upon any other nation because of the sale of munitions and supplies to any one of the other countries.—*From address at convention of New York State Federation of Labor, Jamestown, N. Y., August 31, 1917.*

I know there are some religious, conscientious objectors. They are opposed to war under all circumstances. They are non-resisters and believe that that is the way out. That may be, somewhere in Timbuctoo, but not in Germany or France or Belgium or Serbia or the United States. But ask the men or women belonging to a labor organization what would be their attitude in the event of a conflict between their fellow-workers on the one hand and the employers on the other?

And let me say this, that I hold that a man who is a traitor to his country is upon a par with the scab to his trade. I have a great appreciation and desire to see that the rights of the minority are protected. I believe that men have the right to express their dissent, but the expression of dissent is one thing and the organizing of a movement to destroy the will of the majority —that is not right and cannot be tolerated!—*From address accepting the presidency of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, Minneapolis, Minn., September 7, 1917.*

When it became clear that all which gives life value and vision was challenged by the forces that sought to throttle the power and to destroy opportunity for nations in order to build up dynastic special privileges, and it was plain that democracy the world over was in danger, then our Republic, the first great democratic venture, could not remain neutral in a struggle that meant so much to democracy.

Back of the clash of battle, directing the mobilization of the material resources and man-power of the nation, deeper than the desires that bound men to the institutions of peace, stronger than their abhorrence for maiming and destroying life, is the ideal so deeply rooted in the spiritual fiber of men that they fight the most terrible war of the world's history under its inspiration. That ideal is human opportunity. Because we are convinced that the war we are waging will bring greater opportunity for life not only to individuals but to nations, with full appreciation of the costs we count the gain greater than the loss. —*American Federationist, October, 1917.*

I have heard some men criticize me rather severely because I have counseled my fellow-workers in the United States against participation at this time in international conferences in which representatives of the enemy country would participate. Whatever people have said about me, no one has accused me of being a fool. You can perhaps fool me personally quite easily, but it is not easy, I think, to catch me napping on any big question. My belief is that when these invitations to international conferences were sent out from Petrograd, or Stockholm or Berne, they were already more or less tainted with German militarist sympathies. You never have heard any German representative or any one with German sympathies urge an international conference of labor so long as it seemed likely that the Kaiser's forces were marching triumphantly on Calais or Paris. As soon as the German forces were checked it upset the whole plans of the Kaiser, because there was nothing in their whole plan of forty years' preparation but that looked toward the onward march of the militarist machine, over-riding and crushing everything before it like a juggernaut. After the halt that was the beginning of the end, the intrigues in the other countries began and international conferences were proposed.—*From address*

at Canadian Victory Loan Meeting, Toronto, November 28, 1917.

If any call should be issued for an international conference of workers of all countries of the world, the American Federation of Labor will not participate. The people of Germany must establish democracy within their own domain and make opportunity for international relations that life shall be secure that the people of all countries may live their own lives and work out their own salvation, and unless this has been accomplished by the German people themselves the allied democracies in this struggle must crush militarism and autocracy and bring a new freedom to the whole world, the people of Germany included. Until these essentials are accomplished an international labor conference with the representatives of the workers of all countries (Germany included) is prejudicial to a desirable and lasting peace.—*From cablegram to W. A. Appleton, Secretary General Federation of British Trade Unions, January, 1918.*

American labor glad to meet with representatives labor movements of allied countries but refuses to meet representatives of the labor movements of enemy countries while they are fighting against democracy and world freedom.

In the gigantic task to destroy autocracy there must be hearty coöperation among workers and we hope nothing will interfere with complete understanding and good-will between workers of America and allied countries.—*From cablegram to W. A. Appleton, Secretary General Federation of British Trade Unions, January 9, 1918.*

If any call should be issued for an international conference of workers of *all countries* of the world, the American Federation of Labor will not participate. The people of Germany must establish democracy within their own domain and make opportunity for international relations that life shall be secure, that the people of all countries may live their own lives and work out their own salvation and unless this has been accomplished by the German people themselves the allied democracies in this struggle must crush militarism and autocracy and bring a new freedom to the whole world, the people of Germany included.

Until these essentials are accomplished an international labor conference with the representatives of the workers of all countries, Germany included, is prejudicial to a desirable and lasting peace.—*From cablegram to Arthur Henderson, London, March 13, 1918.*

Then came the murder of innocent men, women and children on the *Lusitania.* When in addition to hundreds of your own people more than one hundred American men and women and children were sent to the bottom——

[Interruptions from the audience: "Where they had the right to go,—they were capitalists."]

No, our people were traveling, people of the United States were traveling upon their legitimate business and going where they had the legal and moral right to go, and they were murdered in cold blood. Further than this there were the men who were cooks and waiters and stokers and sailors on these ships. They were not capitalists. That is the place where they made their living. They were murdered. *They were murdered!* The conscience of our people without regard to nationality or feelings or fatherland or motherland was outraged as was that of the people of the civilized world. Germany promised she would not do it again. By that promise she convicted herself of murder, for if she promised not to do it again it was a confession that she had no right to do it, and then she broke her faith again, and her promises, like her treaties, were regarded as scraps of paper. . . .

By that time I think our people had come to nearly one hundred per cent unity in the determination to live our own lives as best we could and in our own way to help our allied countries in this war. Such a monstrous outrage shall not so easily again be thrust upon the people. Thus it is a war against war, that is what this war is. It is a crusade, a war of the enraged civilian populations defending their menaced liberties and democracies. It is not a capitalist war.

I have seen one here and there who was an ultra-pacifist and who would not defend himself or his home against a murderer. I have heard others preach the same doctrine, and, whether they know it or not, they were doing Germany's work. If ever there was a war in which the vital interests and the rights of the masses

of the people of our democratic countries were involved, this is the war.—*From address before the London, England, Trades Council, September 22, 1918.*

To-day we went to the Piave River and were right up to the front. We were as near the Austrians as the Italian and American soldiers were. It was a gratification for us to be in that situation and that atmosphere—we pacifists transformed into fighting men! . . . This morning the Austrian aeroplanes went over the Italian lines and dropped these two circulars calling upon the Italian soldiers to lay down their arms. They say that Germany and Austria have accepted President Wilson's fourteen propositions and, therefore, now that Germany and Austria are ready to make peace, why continue the fighting? You know as well as I know that the central powers have not accepted President Wilson's fourteen points. They have said, "Let's have an armistice and then we will discuss these fourteen points," but the purpose is simply the same devilish propaganda for the allied countries; let the Austrian and German soldiers call "Kamerad, Kamerad, Kamerad," and then stab the defenseless Italian and their allied soldiers to death. Italy passed through that experience once and knows what was the penalty that she paid. . . .

Germany, her government and her underhand socialist propaganda, planted the seed of discord in all the countries of the world in which she expected at some time or other to have war trouble. That policy was to make internationalism the watchword among the people of these other countries while she maintained the spirit and the purpose of nationalism in Germany. As a consequence, there are quite a number of people who are honestly and conscientiously now, in this war, willing to do anything for what they believe to be internationalism and a premature peace. And this propaganda affords the opportunity for the paid agents of the German government and the Austrian government, to work upon the credulity of the well-intentioned but misguided idealists. . . .

The same situation that presents itself in Italy presents itself in the United States and the other countries. As I said a while ago, the American trade unionists, the American Federation of Labor, have positively refused to permit any such agitation among the organized labor movement of America. We have

understood the German socialist propaganda from the first as being simply the tool of the German military machine of that government. As a consequence, the socialists of Germany, the socialists of Italy, the socialists of England, the socialists of France, have hated the American Federation of Labor.—*From address to the journalists of Padova, Italy, at officers' mess, October 12, 1918.*

I ask you, men, whether you have seen in *"Avanti"* one word of encouragement for the Italian people to stand against German and Austrian aggression in this war? Every trick, every maneuver, every peace propaganda of the central powers to weaken the will of the people of Italy has been fully encouraged and advocated by that group. A few days ago *"Vorwärts,"* the official socialist paper of Germany, published editorially an appeal to German socialists to support the government in its military, economic, and political activities, and urged the soldiers and the people not to lay down their arms five minutes before the absolute security of their country had been guaranteed. Have you seen anything like such an appeal in the *"Avanti"* to the Italian people? . . .

My associates and I went through France; we went through Belgium, what is not occupied by the military machine of Germany, and we have gone through parts of Italy. We have seen the devastation of that murderous military machine of the central powers. We have seen villages and cities destroyed and crumbled, with scarcely one brick or stone standing upon another. We have seen the instruments of torture by which Italian prisoners of war were clubbed to death after they were taken. We have seen, or know of men murdered in cold blood, of women ravaged, and children killed. We have seen or know that men and women and innocent children were sent to a watery grave upon the seas. Is all this to come to an end with Germany and Austria saying "sorry"?—*From address at Milan, Italy, October 13, 1918.*

We have been profoundly impressed by the unity of the real people of Italy, the people who make things go, who do things and who express and represent the true Italian spirit. It takes but a drop of ink to besmirch a clear crystal glass of water, it

takes but one discordant note to mar the harmony of a wonderful orchestra. We have observed since we have been in Italy the attempt to place the drop of ink in the crystal glass of water to besmirch the purity and the patriotism of the Italian people. We have seen since we have been here an attempt by just a small group to sound the discordant note. . . . There has not been one gallant or heroic effort made by the Italian army in this war against militarism that has found one word of commendation or approval on the part of this group. . . .

As soon as this little group of official socialists with its *"Avanti"* knew that we were coming to Italy, they began their attacks upon us, trying to keep the people of Italy away from us so that they could not meet with us. . . . *"Avanti"* has said, I think it was in their issue of to-day, that if we represent four millions of working people we also represent millions of dollars. The fact of the matter is that no one can become a member of an organization affiliated to the American Federation of Labor unless he is a wage-earner. We represent the wage-earners, and not the political tricksters of America or of Italy. It is nothing less than a malicious lie, uttered by the *"Avanti"* for the purpose of discrediting our men. Even if it were true, we can answer—"There are no German dollars."—*From address to American Italian League, Turin, Italy, October 17, 1918.*

I think you are aware that there was a labor conference held in London September 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1918, of the representatives of the labor movements of the allied countries. It was the first one in which the American Federation of Labor participated since the outbreak of the war in 1914. The conferences held by these labor movements of the allied countries were regarded by themselves as ineffective or impotent to deal with the subject, because of the fact that the American Federation of Labor was not represented. We declined to go to Stockholm; we declined to go to Berne; we declined to participate in these conferences in which the representatives of labor of the enemy countries would be permitted to participate. We would not meet them so long as the war was on. In August a delegation of five of us went over to the other side, and in addition to the other work we tried to do in the interest of uniting the people of the various allied countries, the labor movement to stand by

their respective Governments until the war was won, in addition to that effort, which was no mean job, we attended this allied labor conference in London. We made some propositions, some of them of a patriotic character, and some of them of a practical character, suggestions and propositions, which we expressed the hope would be made part of the treaties between the countries of the world at the peace table.—*From testimony at hearing before Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, January 3 and 4, 1919.*

American organized workers have always endeavored to promote good will among the peoples of the world. The possibility of war has ever been regarded by them as the black shadow of an indescribable catastrophe. The interests of the workers are identified with those of peace. War has never meant to them opportunity for gain or exploitation. It has always meant to them privation, direst suffering, service on the firing-line and in the actual fighting of the war, and bearing the burdens that follow in its wake. The workers abhor war with all its frightfulness, horror, bloodshed and mangled flesh, but they realize that there are greater evils than war. Peace secured through the surrender of a principle vital to liberty, justice and democracy is nothing less than coward servility.

The American labor movement never advocated peace at any price. It never encouraged nor gave support to any movement of peace at any price. While it recognizes that peace is essential for normal, progressive development, it steadfastly refused to advocate peace at the sacrifice of the ideals of freedom and justice.—*From "Our Shield Against Bolshevism," McClure's Magazine, April, 1919.*

PREPAREDNESS—NOT MILITARISM

It is plainly evident that the militia of our several States is now never utilized except for purposes of ostentatious show or as an element in labor struggles. There is not even a pretense that they should be what they were originally designed for, "an arming of the people, a citizen soldiery, a National Guard." Instead of being the popular organization in defense of homes and firesides, it has drifted into a machine of monopolistic op-

pression against labor. But one of two courses is open to the trade unionists of our country upon the militia question.

We must endeavor to bring back the militia of our several States to again become the popular military organization of the masses, with the election of the officers by the men; or, failing in that, our organizations will be compelled to declare that membership in a labor organization and the militia at one and the same time is inconsistent and incompatible.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., December, 1892.*

In the German army are nearly thirty thousand officers. Few of them can afford to champion the cause of the "lower orders of society." From their supercilious bearing in public and from common reports as to their class prejudices and manner of life, precious few ever think of doing so. The working classes regard them as fomenters of war, allies of the titled aristocracy, willing servants of the capitalist in time of labor disputes, and enemies of the social progress that comes through peace. The very fact that marriage is forbidden to a German army officer unless he or his intended wife has a stated income, aside from his pay, "sufficient to maintain one of his rank," points to snobbery, parasitism, and fortune hunting. Thus, from every point of view the German army officers form one of the main buttresses to the feudal conception of society as against the democratic—or American—system. . . . It is to be remembered that the German soldier is such by compulsion; he has not, like the American soldier, voluntarily taken on his uniform, nor are the officers, as are more than half in our army, promoted from the ranks or transferred from civil life. Similarly, the high posts in the public service, instead of being the gifts of the people, are still frequently rewards to favorites of the powerful families. With this fact comes the insistence upon social distinctions by the well placed, distinctions carried by a pettiness of spirit into the commonest relations of life. In Germany, "Herr Professoren" and "Frau Doctorinnen," and in Italy "Commendatore" and "Cavalieri," are thicker than "colonels" in Kentucky, with the difference that they expect to be taken seriously as "upper class" social luminaries.—*American Federationist, January, 1910.*

Whenever those who join in military camps or military training must file applications stating their professions or callings, the officers in charge of this work are given a degree of discretion which will enable them to create and encourage undemocratic customs. The greatest protection against the dangers of militarism can be secured through making military training voluntary and as general as possible and through fostering in the citizens the best conception of their duties as American citizens. One method that would promote this purpose is to make the naval and military national schools open to any one who desires to enter, and who has the necessary qualifications, just as entrance to all other institutions of higher learning is open to those who desire to take courses in those institutions. This policy would enable those with ability and with ambition for that kind of work to render service to their country, and would create such a large available supply of men trained to serve as officers that we could feel that we had adequate protection and at the same time had safeguarded against the evils of militarism.—*From letter to General Leonard Wood, September 15, 1915, in response to invitation to visit training camp at Plattsburgh, N. Y.*

The labor movement is militant. The workers understand the necessity for power and its uses. They fully appreciate the important function that power exercises in the affairs of the world. Power does not have to be used in order to be potential. The very existence of power and ability to use that power constitute a defense against unreasonable and unwarranted attack. Ability and readiness for self-defense constitute a potential instrumentality against unnecessary and useless wars, or the denial of rights and justice.—*From address at annual meeting of The National Civic Federation in Washington, D. C., January 18, 1916.*

There is another problem that has a very prominent place in general thought at the present time—this is the problem of national defense and preparedness. The European war has demolished many of our ideas on the subject of peace and our conceptions of human psychology. As a result many have had to abandon former conceptions of policies of national defense and preparedness. We have learned that some constructive measures can be adopted and a definite well coördinated plan

evolved if our nation is to continue to hold its present position in the council of nations and if our citizens are to continue to progress and to secure increasingly better opportunities in our Republic.

Formulation of plans and policies must necessarily be left largely to preliminary committees and commissions. The wage-earners of America are vitally interested in these plans and policies. They bear the brunt of fighting in times of war and suffer most from mistakes of militarism and lack of national preparedness. Therefore, it is essential that representatives of wage-earners should be appointed to all commissions and committees that deal with these matters.—*American Federationist, February, 1916.*

Preparedness is something very different from militarism. Both leave an indelible impression upon the nation, one for freedom and the other for repression. Militarism is a perversion of preparedness—instead of serving the interests of the people, the people are ammunition for these machines. They are destructive to freedom and democracy. . . .

Preparedness is an economic as well as a civic and a military problem. The principles of human welfare can not be ignored in military matters or in plans for national defense, just as they can not be ignored in industry or commerce. That infinitely valuable and sacred thing human creative power, and the safeguarding of human rights and freedom are of fundamental importance and are correlated with national defense and must not be sacrificed to any false concept of national defense. For to what end will a nation be saved, if the citizens are denied that which give life value and purpose? . . .

National preparedness involves the coördination and utilization of national forces and resources. War, as it is being waged to-day, is determined not merely by the men on the battlefield, but also by the mobilization of the national resources, national industries and commerce. The real problem is the organization of the material forces and resources of the country, the coordination of these in the furtherance of a definite military defense policy.

All of the power and resources of the belligerent countries are concentrated to sustain the armies in the field and to equip them

with the necessary supplies as well as the weapons of war. The contest between industries, the question of commercial control, of superiority of economic organization are fully as important as the contest between the soldiers on the battlefield. Whatever, then, is the necessary part of the human, of the organization of industrial and commercial life, is an important factor in national preparedness. . . .

The developments, or rather the events, of the past eighteen months have proven that beautiful ideals and theories without a practical foundation or a practical plan for realizing them, are worse than ineffective, for they create an atmosphere of false safety and a false hope that lull into a fancied security and inactivity and act as a barrier against efforts to think out different and better ways.

As a result of our experiences and observations during the past year and a half we, as a nation, have come to a different and a wiser attitude towards preparedness. We have come to see that preparedness is only the wise forethought of a nation that has taken into account all of the elements of human nature, all of the possibilities and opportunities that may come to the nation, and has tried to think out a definite, sustained plan that will insure to the nation the development and maintenance of their best ideals for the citizens individually and for the nation as a whole. . . .

We are confronted with a question that must be answered—Can democracy be made effective? Democracy, like every other human and national institution, is still on trial. If democracy is to maintain itself, it must be able to defend itself against attacks and invasion. It must be prepared to defend institutions of freedom against force used by others.

Institutions of democracy and ideals of freedom have never been free from attacks and insidious dangers. If we deem them worth defending, we must be ready and able to maintain them with efficiency and effectiveness.

Preparedness against war should be only a small portion of the general comprehensive national policy of preparedness to meet all of the problems of life. It is an all-pervading problem. Plans for preparedness against war must be in accord and coordinate with plans and policies for preparedness in all other relations of life. . . .

Provisions for national defense and preparedness must be in accord with democratic ideals. In other words, military training and military institutions must be a part of the life of the people rather than of a nature to alienate citizens from the spirit, the ideals and the purposes of civil life. A great danger comes from isolating the military, from making military ideals separate and often in conflict with those of the masses of the people. The military should not exist as something apart, but for the service of the whole nation. The naval and military institutions of our country which give a special training to those who have a particular fitness and desire to follow military or naval professions, ought also to be open to all who possess the required qualifications. Such a provision would enable men from all walks of life to enter the army and the navy—a condition which in itself would be in accord with the spirit of democracy.

Wherever the spirit of democracy is absent, there the accompanying evil of militarism, military castes, fasten deadly clutches upon freedom and civic opportunity, and obversely where the spirit of democracy obtains it tends to the abolition of military castes and the inherent vicious dangers of militarism.—*American Federationist, March, 1916.*

There is an immediate, critical situation which the labor movement must meet at once. The whole world is afire and there is imminent danger that at any moment we may become part of the conflagration. National constructive policies of preparedness and defense are now being formulated. The wage-earners of the United States will have to recognize their obligations to maintain institutions of liberty and justice if they are to have part in directing the spirit and the methods that shall be adopted for the defense of our Republic.

Some plan will be adopted. Whatever the plan may be it will affect wage-earners primarily. If in this formative period the labor movement shall clearly enunciate what part it is willing to take in defense of the Republic, it will be in a position to have a voice in deciding the whole plan of national preparedness for defense, but if the labor movement should hold aloof and should refuse to proclaim a constructive program, all wage-earners will be forced to accept conditions and methods determined by those who do not understand or sympathize with the aims or purposes

of the labor movement. In other words, there is now a great opportunity for wage-earners to participate in the formulation of national policies and to assume a helpful, guiding, beneficent part, performing their duties as citizens and at the same time maintaining the rights of free men in order to conserve human interests and welfare.

Either duties and service in connection with national defense will be imposed upon the workers without their advice when formulating these plans, or labor must make this an opportunity for emphasizing the tremendous service that it has rendered to society, both in peace and in war, and for demanding that all plans be in harmony with the thought that human life and human welfare are the ultimate purpose which both peace and war serve.—*From letter March 2, 1917, to presidents of all organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the chiefs of the four railroad brotherhoods.*

I favor some disciplinary measures for the youth of the land. I believe this is essential for the promotion of true national feeling; for the counteraction of destructive propaganda, and for the provision of that alertness, intelligence and amenability to law which the youth of every nation sorely needs. We have just won the war against autocracy and militarism and I am opposed to anything which even smacks of militarism. I have been greatly impressed by the recent statement of Premier Lloyd George of England, that one of the first fruits of the allied victory will be, to a large degree, the bringing about of disarmament among the great nations of the world, the reduction of the military forces to the barest necessities and the cessation, in great measure, of the manufacture of munitions. What the disciplinary measures and the training which may be required should be I would not care to indicate without a further and more intensive study of the subject. It might include a certain amount of drilling, for the disciplinary value that drilling has, and for its value in bringing about a better physical standard among the youth of the nation. This might also be of value in the event that some nation in the future should again attempt, as Germany has done, to usurp the function of world domination, in that it would make the raising and training of an army easier and more rapid. However, I cannot accentuate too

strongly my absolute opposition to any measure that would tend toward militarism, the creation of a military caste or the turning of the thoughts of the nation toward that vain thing known as military glory.—*Statement to the press at Laredo, Texas, November 16, 1918.*

The trade union movement is unalterably and emphatically opposed to "militarism" or a large standing army. "Militarism" is a system fostered and developed by tyrants in the hope of supporting their arbitrary authority. It is utilized by those whose selfish ambitions for power and worldly glory lead them to invade and subdue other peoples and nations, to destroy their liberties, to acquire their wealth and to fasten the yoke of bondage upon them. The trade union movement is convinced by the experience of mankind that "militarism" brutalizes those influenced by the spirit of the institution. The finer elements of humanity are strangled. Under "militarism" a deceptive patriotism is established in the people's minds, where men believe that there is nobility of spirit and heroism in dying for the glory of a dynasty or the maintenance of institutions which are inimical to human progress and democracy. "Militarism" is the application of arbitrary and irresponsible force as opposed to reason and justice. Resistance to injustice and tyranny is that virile quality which has given purpose and effect to ennobling causes in all countries and at all times. The free institutions of our country and the liberties won by its founders would have been impossible had they been unwilling to take arms and if necessary die in the defense of their liberties. Only a people willing to maintain their rights and defend their liberties are guaranteed free institutions.

Conditions foreign to the institutions of our country have prevented the entire abolition of organized bodies of men trained to carry arms. A voluntary citizen soldiery supplies what would otherwise take its place, a large standing army. To the latter we are unalterably opposed as tending to establish the evils of "militarism." Large standing armies threaten the existence of civil liberty. The history of every nation demonstrates that as standing armies are enlarged the rule of democracy is lessened or extinguished. Our experience has been that even this citizen soldiery, the militia of our states, has given cause at times for

grave apprehension. Their ranks have not always been free from undesirable elements, particularly the tools of corporations involved in industrial disputes. During industrial disputes the militia has at times been called upon to support the authority of those who through selfish interests desired to enforce martial law while the courts were open and the civil authorities competent to maintain supremacy of civil law. We insist that the militia of our several states should be wholly organized and controlled by democratic principles so that this voluntary force of soldiery may never be diverted from its true purpose and used to jeopardize or infringe upon the rights and liberties of our people. The right to bear arms is a fundamental principle of our government, a principle accepted at all times by free people as essential to the maintenance of their liberties and institutions. We demand that this right shall remain inviolate.—*From Annual Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlantic City, N. J., June, 1919.*

WHEN THE WAR CAME

A declaration that represents the will of the people speaks with an elementary power that makes the whole world give heed. Such a declaration was that made at a momentous conference held in the American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C., on March 12, 1917. It was a gathering of the responsible, authorized representatives of the trade union movement of America to consider a national problem and to determine what attitude the organized labor movement ought to take in meeting that problem. Because of its daily struggle for justice and freedom in all relations of life, the organized labor movement speaks for the masses of the people.

As our national crisis has become increasingly acute and has gradually dispelled even the most confident faith that our nation could be kept out of war, measures for national preparedness and defense have been growing apace, but no practical program could be adopted or executed without the coöperation of the men and women who use tools. Tools are the basic agencies of civilization.

The greatest problem is always to secure the coöperation of all those whose work is necessary in national defense. For defense our nation must rely upon its machinists and metal

workers, upon those who dig the ditches, who produce the materials of war, upon those whose hands are on the throttles and levers of transportation, who connect the arteries of communication. These workers have become free. They can no longer be told, Come here! Go there! Free workers must give consent. Then sympathy, understanding and coöperation must be elicited. The armies of republics can not be made up of bondmen. All history has taught us that national coöperation can not be secured without arousing a spirit inspired by idealism and fortified by the assurance of the justice of their cause and the righteousness of their methods. . . .

Though various members of the conference expressed differences of opinion and suggested minor amendments to the declaration submitted to them by the council, yet they felt that the changes were details rather than essentials, and they preferred to adopt the declaration as it was rather than interpose the slightest obstacle to the accomplishment of the purpose of the conference. The spirit of patriotism was deep and intense, but equally impressive and intense was the spirit of determination to uphold the rights and opportunities of humanity.

Without a dissenting voice the conference voted to adopt the declaration.*

* The closing sentences of this historic declaration of organized labor, adopted in Washington, March 12, 1917, three weeks before President Wilson appeared before Congress presenting the memorable indictment against Germany, are as follows:

"We, the officers of the National and International Trade Unions of America in national conference assembled in the capital of our nation, hereby pledge ourselves in peace or in war, in stress or in storm, to stand unreservedly by the standards of liberty and the safety and preservation of the institutions and ideals of our Republic.

"In this solemn hour of our nation's life, it is our earnest hope that our Republic may be safeguarded in its unswerving desire for peace; that our people may be spared the horrors and the burdens of war; that they may have an opportunity to cultivate and develop the arts of peace, human brotherhood and a higher civilization.

"But, despite all our endeavors and hopes, should our country be drawn into the maelstrom of the European conflict, we, with these ideals of liberty and justice herein declared, as the indispensable basis for national policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard and preserve the Republic of the United States of America against its enemies whomsoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow workers and fellow citizens in the holy name of Labor, Justice, Freedom and Humanity to devotedly and patriotically give like service."

No more important document was ever issued by a non-governmental agency in the history of this country. It heralds a new era when direction and administration over matters that concern the nation shall be in the hands of those whose brain, sinew and nerve energy have been expended in the service of the nation. The men and the women whose hands are upon the wheels of industry and upon the throttles of transportation, who man the ships that go out to foreign ports, were represented in the conference—who gave to the world a constructive declaration of principles whatever fate betide our nation—peace or war.

It was the voice of the masses declaring "Let us plan to save democracy." In every warring nation democracy has given way to autocracy. Labor wants to prove the efficiency of democracy —let us coöperate upon a basis that will assure whatever of value we already possess and clear the way for the new era—the constructive period of growth and progress under the inspiration of our Democracy United and Efficient.—*American Federationist, April, 1917; "American Labor's Position in Peace or in War."*

I prefer not to ally myself with the conscious or unconscious agents of the Kaiser in America.—*Message, May 10, 1917, in reply to request for use of name, by group of socialist organizers of "First American Conference for Democracy and Terms of Peace," to advocate a "speedy and universal peace."*

The government has no right to lay upon citizens the duty of universal service without assuring to them the means by which they may live and by which those dependent upon them shall be enabled to live as befits those who are making the ultimate sacrifice for their country. . . . Separation payments must be provided before the nation goes much further in arrangements for doing its part in the war. The government can not with justice draft men into service, thus cutting off the income of the family, without making adequate provisions for maintaining the family standards of life. The country is rich. It is now the financial center of the world. We can not wage a war for humanity and at the same time fail to make provisions for humanity at home. If the war is to mean anything, it must bring greater protection for human rights and freedom. To that end we must protect and conserve the human life within our

own borders that we may be fit and capable to conserve human rights and life in the new world we hope to establish.—*American Federationist, June, 1917.*

No one in touch with the present situation imagines that the spirit of greed has been completely eliminated from the industrial and commercial world. Though we regret it, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that the spirit of profiteering makes some employers willing to exploit workers and the nation's need even in this world's critical emergency. Firms in several localities have asked for soldiers to prevent workers trying, through legitimate methods, to secure higher wages in order that their standards may not be lowered through the constantly increasing costs of living.

We know then that these unprincipled, heartless employers will not hesitate to make use of conscription machinery to rid themselves of "undesirable" workmen and thus give such employers a free hand to force unendurable conditions of work and pay.

It is the desire of all good citizens that in our efforts to fight a war for justice abroad we shall not at the same time impose injustice upon men and women at home. In order to prevent discrimination or favoritism and to create in the minds of the masses of citizens confidence that the government desires to do justice to all, the organized labor movement urges that representatives of labor be upon all exemption boards. This matter has been taken up with officers charged with the administration of the selective conscription law.—*From press statement, June 11, 1917.*

At the first meeting of the Committee on Labor of the Council of National Defense, a resolution was adopted protesting against this general movement to suspend labor laws and labor standards. That resolution was referred to the Advisory Commission, adopted by that body, and also by the Council of National Defense. Strangely enough when the resolution was made public, the metropolitan press, with one accord, misinterpreted the thought and purpose of the resolution by sensational headlines and editorial comment to the effect that the workers would forego all strikes during the period of the war and would agree to any

conditions rather than interrupt production. This statement was in direct conflict with facts. No representative of organized labor has been authorized to make such a declaration, and no one has made such a declaration. . . .

In addressing that committee [Committee on Labor, May 15, 1917] he [President Wilson] made the following statement:

"I have been very much alarmed at one or two things that have happened: at the apparent inclination of the legislatures of one or two of our states to set aside even temporarily the laws which have safeguarded the standards of labor and of life. I think nothing would be more deplorable than that. *We are trying to fight in a cause which means the lifting* of the standards of life, and we can fight in that cause best by voluntary coöperation."

These declarations are in accord with the principles adopted by the representatives of the organized labor movement of America before war was declared.—*American Federationist, July, 1917.*

When I worked at the bench, I was in a number of strikes. There was one strike in the shop in which I was working, and my judgment was that it was an inopportune time for the men in that shop to strike. I was firmly convinced that they were justified in striking, but I knew as well as I know anything that has not yet occurred, that we would be defeated if we inaugurated the strike.

I was the only man in that shop who had that view. I did not vote against the strike. I expressed my views to the boys, but they did not hold my view and they decided that we should strike. Do you think for a moment that I would remain in that shop and work while they went on strike?

Supposing in any of our unions a question, a wage reduction or a demand for a wage increase came up and the question of striking was adopted by two-thirds of the men, or three-fourths of them—do you think for a moment that the one-third or the one-fourth of them have the right to say that the three-fourths are wrong and that they are going to continue to work and play the part of the scab and the strike-breaker? I hold that the same rule applies to the republic in which we live. I suppose that there are not many, in our time, who will hold that our country can be governed without laws of some kind.

We have a Constitution—the Constitution of the United States. We are living under the Declaration of Independence.

Under the laws and the Constitution of the United States, the representatives and senators in Congress assembled have the power to declare and make war. In the Senate of the United States, in the House of Representatives of the United States, there were not more than two or three who voted against the Government and the people of the United States making war upon the Imperial Government of Germany. In other words, the representatives of the people of this Republic, in Congress assembled, under the authority of the Constitution of the United States, made that declaration of war.

Any man living in our country who is unwilling to stand behind that declaration is unworthy to enjoy the guarantees of peace.—*From address at convention of New York State Federation of Labor, Jamestown, N. Y., August 31, 1917.*

There are some people who have said that this question of the declaration of war should have gone to a referendum vote. I wonder, if a band of a dozen or more men would endeavor to surround the home in which you live and then demand your surrender of your property, and in the meantime, while you are considering the subject, discharge their revolvers, killing your wife and your children—whether you would call a meeting for the deliberation of the subject and a vote as to whether you should defend yourself.

As one who has for nearly his whole life been an advocate of the initiative and the referendum in legislation as well as in the labor movement, I am free to say this—that if a situation occurred such as I have tried to outline to you, I would try to pull first before the other fellow got it on me.—*From address accepting the presidency of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, Minneapolis, Minn., September 7, 1917.*

Suppose we had decided to take a referendum vote after the *Lusitania* was sunk. How was it to be taken? It might have taken six, seven, eight months before the final decision. What provision in the Constitution speaks of a referendum in case of war? In the meantime, if it hadn't been for the proud fighting remnant of outraged Belgium and the men of France and the whole-hearted Britishers, we might have had a visit from the Imperial Kaiser, and we would have had to tell him to please

vacate because we hadn't completed our referendum.—*From address at Faneuil Hall Meeting under auspices of the Central Labor Union, Boston, May 1, 1918.*

THROUGH THE HEAT AND BURDEN

The American Alliance for Labor and Democracy sends greetings to the fighters for liberty in Russia as brothers in the same cause. The aims of the Russian democracy are our aims; its victory is our victory and its defeat is our defeat; and even the traitors that assail the Russian democracy likewise assail us. In the conflict for the liberty of Russia, the liberty of America is likewise at stake. Every Russian soldier who faces unflinchingly the enemy in the field is striking a blow for the liberty of America.—*From message to Russian Premier Kerensky, September 13, 1917.*

It is proposed as a result of a great conference which closed in Minneapolis a week ago to-night, so far as possible to let every controversial question be laid on the table until after the war is closed. Of course, my friends, I would not have you or any one else interpret that statement to mean that the human aspiration for a better life can be or will be suppressed; that ought to be encouraged; but shall we array church against church, party against party, religion against religion, politics against politics, nationality against nationality, aye, even wrangle over raising funds to carry on the war, the bonds that are to be issued? Let us do our share to see to it that Uncle Sam has the fighting men and the men to produce at home and the money with which to carry on the war. Let us defer questions which can be deferred, questions that are likely to divide any appreciable element of our people in this war; let us remain united and fight it out, no matter how long we fight, until America and America's allies shall have proved victorious in the struggle.—*From address before The National Security League, Chicago, Ill., September 14, 1917.*

The expression has long been accepted as fact—that we of the United States are not yet a nation. That development will come out of the bloodshed and the united effort necessary to defend

our republic. Sometimes in the world's history, through the shedding of blood comes redemption.

The fundamental condition necessary for unity of action is understanding of the issues involved and the purposes of the government. Misunderstanding is the root of much evil and can not be permitted when so much is at stake. . . .

Because of common peril and common conviction, there has developed a deeper and truer spirit of fraternity and comradeship in the work of this war. The ideals that are the meaning of America, are at stake and the citizens have been conscripted into service in their defense. This conscription does not imply only enforced service but a dedication of our lives and all that we have and are in furtherance of democratic institutions and opportunity.—*American Federationist, October, 1917.*

Some have said that they want an immediate peace. I ask you, my friends, and I pray that you may ask any one who urges an immediate peace, what the meaning of it all would be. Suppose we could establish peace this very night and wake up to-morrow morning with this war ended, what would it mean? . . .

With peace to-morrow morning, the Kaiser's military machine has won, the whole history of the world for all time must write down that the militarist machine of the Kaiser has been victorious. . . .

A peace to-morrow morning is a justification of the policy of German militarism and the mere postponement of the balance of the fight to some other time. We are in this war, men and women—we are in this war! We may never again find the civilized nations, the democracies of the world, so united against autocracy and militarism.—*From address at Anti-Disloyalty Mass Meeting in Carnegie Hall, New York, November 2, 1917.*

A few weeks ago a Russian came to my office in Washington, and while we were discussing certain matters he was seriously asked the question whether he approved of the idea being proclaimed by some Russian leaders that there should be a vote by the soldiers whether or not a particular advance should be made. He answered yes. He really believed it. Can you imagine a great army corps covering an area of two, three or four hundred

miles, and each regiment and each company voting on the question of whether they should advance or retreat? And just imagine one regiment voting aye and another voting no! What wonderful discipline and effectiveness there would be in such an army! I wonder where General Haig would be if that system prevailed in the forces of the British, Canadian or Australian boys? This is war. This is not playing a game of war, and when the Congress of the United States or the Parliament of Canada has decreed lawfully a certain course, it is the duty of every man to stand by and see that that policy is put into successful operation. The same is equally true of the general staff of any army. When the Commander in Chief issues an order it is the duty of every soldier to obey.—*From address at Canadian Victory Loan Meeting, Toronto, November 28, 1917.*

This war has brought out in illumination a new interpretation of service. This war is being fought by whole nations, not merely by the men on the firing line. Those in military service are helpless without the coöperation of those rendering service in industry and in transporting troops, in making supplies and munitions of war. This war has no place for parasites or special privileges founded upon tradition or legalistic fiction. There is a place only for those who render service. This is the revolutionary spirit which the world war is breeding in every country and in every army, our own included.

Those who stand on the firing line and face death in the most awful forms that human intelligence can devise will never again accept unquestioned institutions and standards based upon any other principle except service. Those in the factories, the mines, and the shops who have once had this war standard applied to their work, will accept none other unquestioned.

This is the spirit of revolution which has been felt stirring us all. It is this revolutionary spirit seeking justice in all relations between men that has aroused concern for existing institutions.

But there is nothing to fear from this constructive spirit of revolution. On the contrary, it presages a new age—a forward movement for the well-being of humanity. It is the thrilling spirit of the Marseillaise that has stirred many a heart to deeper determination for service in the cause of human freedom.

It is the purpose of all liberty-loving men and women that

this shall be the nature and the effect of the war for which they are sacrificing so much.—*American Federationist, December, 1917.*

An injured worker, physically disabled in some respect, is an additional hazard in industry and at once raises the question as to the application of compensation laws. These workers may not attain the same degree of efficiency as do other workers. This raises wage problems. As a matter of public policy our nation can not afford to be responsible for under-cutting wages of normal men through the employment of those of subnormal efficiency. The whole problem of placing back into the economic structure returned and disabled soldiers, without safeguards, is a complicated problem but one that must be met by the nation. Many of these soldiers who return will be unable without assistance to find a place in industry and society where they can be self-supporting and self-respecting. There is need of national coördinated action for the protection of these men, as well as for the protection of national interests.

The nation has felt justified in conscripting men and asking them to do service under the most terrific hazards and dangers that the world has ever known. The nation can not shirk the responsibility of taking care of those who suffer because of this service. The establishment of ways and means to discharge this duty must be met without delay, and long before the war has been won.—*American Federationist, January, 1918.*

We are face to face with a world crisis. We are in a world struggle which will determine for the immediate future whether principles of democratic freedom or principles of force shall dominate. The decision will determine not only the destiny of nations but of every community and of every individual. No life will be untouched.

Either the principles of free democracy or of Prussian militaristic autocracy will prevail. There can be no compromises. So there can be no neutrality among nations or individuals—we must stand up and be counted with one cause or the other. For Labor there is but one choice.

The hope of labor lies in opportunity for freedom. The workers of America will not permit themselves to be deceived or

deceive themselves into thinking the fate of the war will not vitally change our own lives. A victory for Germany would mean a pan-German empire dominating Europe and exercising a world balance of power which Germany will seek to extend by force into world control.

Prussian rule means supervision, checks, unfreedom in every relation of life.

Prussianism has its roots in the old ideal under which men sought to rule by suppressing the minds and wills of their fellows; it blights the new ideal of government without force or chains—political or industrial—protected by perfect freedom for all.

Unless the reconstruction shall soon come from the German workers within that country it is now plain that an opportunity to uproot the agencies of force will come only when democracy has defeated autocracy in the military field, and wins the right to reconstruct relations between nations and men. The peace parleys between Russia and Germany have shown the futility of diplomatic negotiations until Prussian militarists are convinced they can not superimpose their will on the rest of the world. Force is the basis of their whole organization and is the only argument they will understand.

Spontaneous uprisings in Germany in protest against the militarist government have shown that the German government is still stronger than the movement for German emancipation. German freedom is ultimately the problem of the German people. But the defeat of Prussian autocracy on the battlefield will bring an opportunity for German liberty at home.

We have passed the period when any one nation can maintain its freedom irrespectively of other nations. Civilization has closely linked nations together by the ties of commerce, and quick communication, common interests, problems and purposes. The future of free nations will depend upon their joint ability to devise agencies for dealing with their common affairs so that the greatest opportunity for life, liberty and pursuit of happiness may be assured to all.

This matter of world democracy is of vital interest to Labor. Labor is not a sect or a party. It represents the invincible desire for greater opportunity of the masses of all nations. Labor is the brawn, sinews and brains of society. It is the user of

tools. Tools under the creative power of muscle and brains shape the materials of civilization. Labor makes possible every great forward movement of the world. But labor is inseparable from physical and spiritual life and progress. Labor now makes it possible that this titanic struggle for democratic freedom can be made.

The common people everywhere are hungry for wider opportunities to live. They have shown the willingness to spend or be spent for an ideal. They are in this war for ideals. Those ideals are best expressed by their chosen representative in a message delivered to the Congress of the United States January 8, setting forth the program of the world's peace. President Wilson's statement of war aims has been unreservedly endorsed by British organized labor. It is in absolute harmony with the fundamentals endorsed by the Buffalo convention of the American Federation of Labor.

We are at war for those ideals. Our first big casualty list has brought to every home the harass and the sacrifices of war. This is only the beginning. A gigantic struggle lies just ahead that will test to the uttermost the endurance and the ability and the spirit of our people. That struggle will be fought out in the mines, farms, shops, mills, shipyards, as well as on the battlefield. Soldiers and sailors are helpless if the producers do not do their part. Every link in the chain of the mobilization of the fighting force and necessary supplies is indispensable to winning the war against militarism and principles of unfreedom.

The worker who fastens the rivets in building the ship is performing just as necessary war service to our Republic as the sailor who takes the ship across or the gunner in the trenches.

This is a time when all workers must soberly face the grave importance of their daily work and decide industrial matters with a conscience mindful of the world relation of each act.

The problem of production indispensable to preventing unnecessary slaughter of fellowmen is squarely up to all workers—aye, to employees and employers. Production depends upon materials, tools, management, and the development and maintenance of industrial morale. Willing coöperation comes not only from doing justice but from receiving justice. The worker is a human being whose life has value and dignity to him. He is willing to sacrifice for an ideal but not for the selfish gain of

another. Justice begets peace. Consideration begets coöperation. These conditions are essential to war production. Production is necessary to win the war.

Upon the government and upon employers falls the preponderance of responsibility to securing greatest efficiency from workers. Standard of human welfare and consideration of the human side of production are part of the technique of efficient production.

Give workers a decent place to live, protect them against conditions which take all their wages for bare existence, give them agencies whereby grievances can be adjusted and industrial justice assured, make it plain that their labor counts in the winning a war for greater freedom, not for private profiteering, and workers can be confidently expected to do their part. Workers are loyal. They want to do their share for the Republic and for winning the war.

This is labor's war. It must be won by labor and every stage in the fighting and the final victory must be to count for humanity. That result only can justify the awful sacrifice.

We present these matters to the workers of free America, confidently relying upon the splendid spirit and understanding which has made possible present progress, to enable us to fight a good fight and to establish principles of freedom throughout the whole world. We regret that circumstances make impossible continuous close personal relations between the workers of America and those of the allied countries, and that we can not have representation in the Inter-Allied Labor Conference about to convene in London.

Their cause and purpose are our cause and purpose. We can not meet with representatives of those who are aligned against us in this world war for freedom, but we hope they will sweep away the barriers which they have raised between us. Freedom and the downfall of autocracy must come in Middle Europe.

We doubly welcome the change if it come through the workers of those countries. While this war shall last, we shall be working and fighting shoulder to shoulder with fellow workers of Great Britain, France, and Italy. We ask the workers of Russia to make common cause with us, for our purpose is their purpose, that finally the freedom lovers of all countries may make the

world safe for all peoples to live in freedom and safety.—*American Federationist, March, 1918.*

To the Russian People:

Prussian militarism and brutality menace free Russia now as never before. Just as it would despoil all free countries, so now the German military machine is sweeping on, despoiling vast sweeps of Russian territory. The clear object of Germany is the destruction of Russian freedom and the annexation of a great area of Russian territory.

German autocracy is the great, unscrupulous enemy of all free peoples. Democracy can not live anywhere unless this autocracy is crushed. Democracy everywhere must sweep back the German tyrants in defeat.

The American people understand the German plan. They have pledged everything they possess to defeat it for freedom's sake. With all other free people they have been shocked but not surprised at the duplicity of Germany in its dealings with Russia. Now that the German mask is off entirely and the German armies are marching over Russian soil to conquer and hold, the free people of America send a message of encouragement to the free Russians. We say, rally to the struggle against autocracy. Only armed force can meet the German hordes. The working people of America are with you and with all free peoples in the common struggle for freedom and its boundless opportunities. Hold the line! Rise in all your might and strike for your home, your lives, your liberties. The democracies of the world, determined to maintain freedom, can not be beaten if they stand firmly together.

We, the working people of America, call across the world to you to pledge again our whole strength in the common struggle for humanity. Stand with us to the end for the right of all peoples to be free. Stand with us to win this war against enslaving and debasing autocracy. We sent you cheer and our pledge of high resolve and fixed purpose. Let the free peoples of the world stand shoulder to shoulder for the defeat of militarism, autocracy and the enslaving of the human race.—*Message to the People of Russia, March 1, 1918.*

For those whose dear ones are in places of great danger it is a comfort to know that the American Red Cross is performing

more effective service on a larger scale than ever before. . . . As time goes on the scope of the work of the Red Cross in Europe will increase in order that the organization may meet the demands that will be made upon it. It must receive the full and hearty support of the American people. It is only through such an agency that we can be assured relief and necessary ministration to our young men forming our military force.—*From press statement, March, 1918.*

We are at war, and as far as I am concerned, that war has got to be fought until either autocracy is crushed or democracy enthroned. I am not going to encourage my fellow countrymen in a discussion of peace when there is no peace possible. If ever the present day pacifists have been confounded the situation in Russia is their answer. . . . To talk peace now is playing the German game to win the people of the allied countries from the will to fight for the right. Talking peace now is not doing the cause of democracy and of our Allies the right kind of service.

In the United States, our President has given forth our fundamental war aims. England and France have declared adherence to those war aims. The American labor movement stands behind the President of the United States. The labor movements of France and of England have also declared their acceptance of the position of the war aims as set forth by President Wilson. Then, wherefore, why this criticism of the American labor movement? In what are we behind? I venture to express the opinion that there is not better agreement, if there exists so good between the Government of any of the countries fighting in Europe—Allies and all—as there exists between the Government of the United States and the American Federation of Labor. I think I am justified in believing that that statement may be regarded by some with a degree of contempt, simply because it is so near; it is at home, and it is the American labor movement, and the intellectuals, so-called, are not dominating that movement.—*From address at reception to the Visiting British Labor Union Delegates, tendered by The National Civic Federation, March 16, 1918.*

Workers of America—you have as much if not more at stake than any other group of citizens. You are urged to subscribe as

generously to this loan as is within your power. Do all that you can for the common cause of democracy and freedom the world over.—*From press statement, April, 1918.*

Whether there shall be freedom, opportunity and progress, or repression and autocratic control rests with the conflict now raging. Every nation has something vital at stake.

Our own country is fighting for the principles and the institutions which our fathers expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation, that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce, and every other issue that has reached the fundamentals of human relationship. . . .

The fundamental demand which labor makes at the beginning of the second year of the war is that workers be accorded power in proportion to their responsibility. Wherever production has been organized on the human as well as the material side, and where there are maintained well-established principles of industrial justice and human well-being, wage-earners have rendered splendid service in the war for human freedom. Wherever their experience and their position is not considered production has not been organized in a way to secure the fullest output, and workers, although without power to act, have been unjustly held in a large degree responsible for any failure. . . .

America's workers are doing their part not only in war production but in all lines of service. They are in the fighting lines, on the ships, helping to direct the legislative and administrative agencies of government, supporting the financial resources necessary to the war, contributing to the Red Cross, and other beneficent agencies. In short, there is no national interest with which they are not identified. This in itself demonstrates the democratic genius of our people and our Republic, and it is because of this democratic tradition, spirit and opportunity that the workers are ready to render loyal service. They know that American democracy is a vital force giving them opportunity—something of greater value than anything else in life. They know that autocracy would wrest from them all that they hold of value.

The second year of the war finds them with unflinching de-

termination to fight until autocracy has been destroyed and democracy assured. Now for whole-hearted, whole-souled drive of all our people—soldiers, sailors, airmen and workers—a drive, a resistless conquering drive that shall result in bringing a lasting peace to the world and establish justice, freedom and democracy to all the people of all the world.—*American Federationist, April, 1918.*

There is no question but what there was understanding between the socialist political leaders of Germany and the German Imperialist Government to carry out its policies. The socialists in the German Reichstag voted solidly for the military credits of that Government. The socialists of Germany began the propaganda years and years ago to instil into the minds of the peoples of other countries that which was in accord with their Emperor's declaration that he was a war lord, but he proposed to use the great army of Germany to maintain the peace of the world; and the propaganda of the German socialists was to hypnotize the people of all the other countries into believing that there was no need on their part, on our part, to prepare against any hostile demonstration on the part of the German army.

The philosophy of human brotherhood is an alluring one, and one to which I have been a devotee nearly all my life. My friends in America, my friends who are here, who know me, know that I never was fooled by the sophistry and pretences of the socialists. As a matter of fact, there is not in England, France, nor America a socialist party of those countries. In America we have a German branch of the German socialist party. Let me explain a moment something that may be illuminating. The Socialist Party of the United States is made up of different nationalities and some Americans. The Americans have left the party since the perfidy of the Socialist Party in the United States when it revealed its true colors, when it showed itself to be a German agency in the United States.

There have been many attempts made since the war began, to get the American labor movement into a conference for the purpos of discussing questions of peace. And I may say in passing that I trust you will understand that when I use the term "America" I do not use it in the sense of the United States alone; I refer to America, this great American continent of ours. We

have our different political systems and governments, independent of each other, but we are brothers in a great common cause. At this conference it was proposed the representatives of the labor movement of Germany and Austria should participate. We have declared that we will meet with the representatives of labor of the allied countries, but we will not confer with the representatives of enemy countries unless first the German army and hordes get out of France and Belgium and back on to German soil, or until we have smashed kaiserism, if in the meantime kaiserism is not smashed from within.

Desirous of having a general understanding, representatives of labor, of Canada and of England, have come to the United States for conferences, and conferences have been held. Recently another delegation of British workers came to the United States for conference and for the purpose of conveying to the people the real situation and the real needs, and the duties of all. The American Federation of Labor has sent over a delegation of seven men and two women, wage workers. They have been in Great Britain now for about two and a half weeks. Your papers this morning give an account of their activities on the other side and the statement is cabled over here from London that the thought among the workers of England of conferences with the enemy countries has almost entirely disappeared.

From address in the Canadian House of Commons, Ottawa, Can., April 27, 1918.

Workers of America, the safety of that battle line in France depends mainly now upon us. We must furnish the majority of those in the trenches. We must build the ships that carry the troops and munitions of war. Regardless of hidden dangers we must maintain the life-line of ships on the high seas which connect the fighting front with our national bases of supplies. We must make the guns, the munitions, the aeroplanes. We must have ready food, clothing, blankets. We serve in the great industrial army that serves overseas with the fighting forces.

We must do all these things because a principle is involved that has to do with all we hold dear.

We are fighting against a government that disregards the will of the governed—a government that pries into intimate relations of life and extends its supervision into smallest details and domi-

nates all of them. We are fighting against involuntary labor—against the enslavement of women and the mutilation of the lives and bodies of little children. We are fighting against barbarous practices of warring upon civilian populations, killing the wounded, the agents of mercy and those who bear the white flag of truce.

We are fighting for the ideal which is America—equal opportunity for all. We are fighting for political and economic freedom—national and international.

We are fighting for the right to join together freely in trade unions and the freedom and the advantages represented by that right.

Our country is now facing a crisis to meet which continuity of war production is essential. Workers, decide every industrial question fully mindful of those men—fellow Americans—who are on the battle line, facing the enemies' guns, needing munitions of war to fight the battle for those of us back at home, doing work necessary but less hazardous. No strike ought to be inaugurated that can not be justified to the men facing momentary death. A strike during the war is not justified unless principles are involved equally fundamental as those for which fellow citizens have offered their lives—their all.

We must give this service without reserve until the war is won, serving the cause of human freedom, intelligent, alert, uncompromising wherever and whenever the principles of human freedom is involved.

We are in a great revolutionary period which we are shaping by molding every day relations between man and man. Workers of America as well as all other citizens have difficult tasks to perform that we might hand on to the future the ideals and institutions of America not only unimpaired, but strengthened and purified in spirit and in expression—thus performing the responsible duty of those entrusted with the high resolve to be free and perpetuate freedom.—*American Federationist, May, 1918.*

The war is forcing us to an attitude of discerning discrimination—every personal habit has a cumulative effect upon national affairs. War savings stamps will encourage that attitude in all. Children can learn the meaning of war savings—that they can

choose between loaning their quarters or dollars to the government on interest and spending them for useless things. The child who learns to save pennies until he has enough to buy a war savings stamp, who chooses between a temporary gratification and permanent constructive purpose is acquiring a personal habit that will help him throughout life.

In addition to inculcating thrift, war savings stamps represent a method so essentially democratic that the whole nation may participate in helping the government. War savings stamps are based upon principles so constructive and beneficial that they ought to become a permanent national institution as a part of the postal savings banks.

We hope that every union organization will institute plans for promoting the sale of war savings and thrift stamps among their members and that every worker will teach his children the meaning and value of these stamps. . . .

We can forego luxuries for a time, be content with the primary necessaries of life, in order to save for the future our heritage of freedom and the things of the spirit.

During the time when we send our young men to the trenches, to live a life that grills flesh and nerve, let every man, woman and child who is privileged to remain in free America in physical safety, count it a freeman's duty to eat simple food and conserve for our army and our allies; to wear simple clothes, to avoid unnecessary or unwise expenditures, that we may give to our fighting men, the government, and have resources for the constructive work of the country.

This does not mean foolish penury or asceticism, but constructive, intelligent expenditure and saving—the establishment of habits of rational expenditure of money so as to accomplish a purpose and to get the greatest returns from the expenditure.

There are still many to whom this world cataclysm has so little meaning that they are still pursuing luxuries and self-indulgence. . . .

Workers of America, you have more at stake than any other group. It is fitting that you take your part in economy to win the war.

Organize for constructive saving—saving for the cause of democracy and human equity. Make plain living, plain dressing and practical patriotism the outward manifestation of your

patriotism and willingness to give service to the cause which has been the highest ideal of freemen of all ages.—*American Federationist, June, 1918.*

If there had been a bona fide labor movement in Russia something like the American Federation of Labor you would never have had the Bolsheviki in Russia. If it had not been for the American Federation of Labor during the war, you would have the Bolsheviki in the United States.—*From address at Faneuil Hall Meeting under auspices of the Central Labor Union, Boston, May 1, 1918.*

The American Federation of Labor passed a resolution since the war insisting upon two things; one, that when the official delegates from the governments shall meet to determine the treaty of peace, first, there should be official representation of the organized labor movement on these official delegations; second, that there shall be a world labor conference held at the same time and place by the labor movements of all the countries. We have not any enmity against the German people themselves. Miseducated and misled, they have got to fight or die. When this resolution was sent to Mr. Carl Legien, he ridiculed it and said: "What influence can we have with our government?" They have none, of course, because their government is not based upon even manhood suffrage. I grant you no man can tell me the faults of the British system of government. I think I know some of them. No man can tell me anything now about the faults of the American system of government. I grant you I know them. But here and in America at least there is the element of opportunity to work out our freedom. And if we do not work out our freedom in our democracies, it is our fault and not the democracies'. . . . When we were here about two or three days we saw the policemen of the city of London on strike. We were told that there were fourteen or fifteen thousand of them. Other strikes are actually in contemplation. I am not criticizing the strikes. I am merely calling attention to the fact that here you have a law making such strikes illegal. In the United States we have defeated every proposition to make strikes illegal, and yet we are getting results for our people, and we are giving voluntary service. . . .

Imagine the freedom which even the German workmen have.

They have no right of free assemblage, no right of free speech. Do you think for a moment that if a meeting of this character were held in the city of Berlin the gentleman would have been permitted to say what he did? It is only because we are fighting for his freedom that he has the right to say indecent things. [General disorder and several interruptions.] If Germany could win, there would be no opportunity for freedom in England, in France, in America, in Ireland. No more than, perhaps much less than, now prevails in Germany. . . .

We come to bring this message to you to-day in all kindness and good will. We feel and know that at heart the workers of Britain are at least ninety-eight per cent for democracy and for the winning of the war. Here and there we have found a spark but it is not lasting. It is but a flash and it is gone and the heart and the conscience of British labor goes on and on, true to its traditions, true to the great character of British men who dare to think and declare and do, and bear the consequences of their doing.

I am sure that British labor with the great British people will stand shoulder to shoulder during this fight to maintain the homes, the firesides, the conditions of labor, the freedom of the workers and the masses of the people so that when this war shall have come to a glorious ending the workers will take their places of great importance in the new life of the world, when new relations between the nations of the world shall be established. This is the work, this is the struggle, this is the task, that is the hope.

I am with you one hundred per cent in the prosecution of this crusade, in every effort you make, in every sacrifice. The glorious triumph will come to us and to ours. The children of the generations yet unborn upon whom the problems and the hope of the world will then rest, will bless or curse us as we have performed or failed to perform our part in the great struggle for human liberty. [Note: The resolution favorable to Mr. Gompers' position and endorsing the position of the American labor movement was unanimously adopted.]—*From address before the London Trades Council, September 22, 1918.*

We peace loving peoples of the world were drawn into this maelstrom of wholesale murder and destruction. We could do

naught but fight or be a people known for cowards and poltroons. Our cause is the greatest cause which the people of any nation in any time in the history of the world have been called upon to espouse. All that is implied by your early civilization in Italy, all those great struggles and human sacrifices for right from the Crusades to the American Revolution, the French Revolution and the Italian Revolt, from Magna Charta to the Declaration of Independence and the Civil War to maintain the Union and abolish human slavery, is involved in this great struggle. And at this crucial moment, what better could express the sentiment which should prevail than to couple the names of your great and beloved Mazzini, Garibaldi and Bautiste with the names of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and Wilson?—*From address at luncheon tendered the American Labor Mission by Ambassador Thomas Nelson Page, at Rome, Italy, October 9, 1918.*

I salute you all and greet you as men who are in the vanguard of the fighting forces of the world to save your country and France and England and America. . . . It is a hard task living and fighting as you men do here, but it is not only for you; the sacrifices and the hardships are yours, but all that you do and all that you suffer is for the welfare of humanity, for your country, for your fathers and mothers, sisters, or sweethearts, or wives, for your children and your children's children who will come after you. It is a worthy cause, and you should be proud and willing, as I know you are, to do your part to pay the big price, for nothing will be worth while, even life itself, if we do not win. And we will win. It is writ in the great volume of human justice that we are going to win this war. We are going to triumph. Militarism shall be crushed. Autocracy will be crushed, and the liberty-loving people of the world will be assured that priceless privilege of living their own lives in peace and happiness, pursuing the arts of peaceful industry.—*From address to soldiers and laborers at the Front, Mont Grappa, Italy, October 11, 1918.*

We made provision and helped contribute to maintain the standards of life of the families of our fighting boys, that while they were over in France fighting they might have the satisfaction of knowing that it was not by charity that the home and family were being maintained, but as a matter of right, and that after

the war was over they could enter into those homes just as or better than they had left them. This knowledge has given our fighting boys in France encouragement. It was one of the greatest pieces of legislative work ever conceived and enacted when, out of the Committee on Labor, of which I had the honor of being chairman,—one of the committees of the Council of National Defense—we secured the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' compensation law and the abolition of the system of pensions, which in our own lives has been made the battledore and shuttlecock of politics, with candidates for Congress elected or defeated on that issue. Soldiers' compensation has been taken out of the political realm and made automatic.—*From address on Steamship "Rotterdam," April 8, 1919.*

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The maintenance of justice and peace between nations is now emerging from the same chaotic conditions which formerly characterized the relations between individuals. There are evidences which intimate that intelligence will emerge out of this chaos—international solidarity of labor, international law, treaties of peace and commerce, arbitration treaties, The Hague Tribunal. With these accumulating institutions to bind the nations together, there is developing a code of international morality and a habit of mind necessary to enforce standards of international morality upon all.

These things are the rudiments from which will emerge a world government, a world federation competent to do justice between nations and able to maintain the peace of the world. That is the ideal we must seek to realize, which we must establish in the day of peace that we may dispel the war clouds ere the storm of conflict is upon us. War can be abolished only by eternal vigilance in protecting peace and in promoting the things that make for peace. Peace and the things associated with peace must be made of such value that men will not dare risk them to chances and the havoc of war.—*From Labor Day address at Plattsburgh, N. Y., September 7, 1914.*

Above and beyond the desire of America's workers to secure a settlement that will safeguard their own and the nation's ma-

terial interests is their desire to see a settlement that will render war less probable and peace more permanent in the future; for the interests of the men and women of labor are identified with those of peace. War has never meant for them opportunity for gain or exploitation. It has always meant to them sacrifice and suffering in the actual fighting of the war and the bearing of heavy burdens after the war. Certainly working people have bought with their flesh and blood the right to a voice in determining the issues of peace and war; and in the general organization that will follow the present war, the workers will insist upon having voice and influence. Labor is committed to the principle that peace is the basis of all civilization. . . .

The bitter experience of this war will prove to all nations that the system of small group alliances, armed to the teeth and eternally growling at each other, is a poor way to run the business of the world. It seems practically certain that instinct, as well as reason, will react against this system of armed peace toward some larger federation of the nations. Since such a Court or League as contemplated appears to be the inevitable goal toward which the whole evolution of law and government is tending, laboring men of this and every other nation will feel it their duty and privilege to lift their voice in counsel at every step of the plans and propaganda, in order to make more certain the triumph of democratic principles and methods, in whatever may be the final form of such an international institution.—*From address at convention of the League to Enforce Peace, Washington, D. C., May 26, 1916.*

In order that the wage-workers of America may be ready to participate in the field of international affairs it is necessary for us to consider various tentative suggestions and to determine upon a definite program promoting labor's interest.

The various proposals for the organization of international relations disclose that the field and its problems are analogous to those of relations between individuals—a domain that is now systematically regulated by the governments of the various states. Some of the same principles will apply to the larger domain between nations.

We submit that there ought to be a voluntary union of nations, a league for peace, to adjust disputes and difficulties and to take

the initiative in constructive efforts to direct and facilitate world progress in accord with highest concepts.

Among the suggestions usually made for maintaining peace is arbitration. Arbitration has been so generally discussed that it is not necessary at this time for us to consider its purposes and function. However, it has been generally conceded that arbitration has an exceedingly important field of service within definite limitations.

Arbitration can be effective only in the adjustment of differences and thus is limited to justiciable matters. We suggest therefore that it is not suited to adjust difficulties that are most likely to threaten peace between countries and it can not deal constructively with elements and conditions in their making, which when further developed would inevitably result in friction, misunderstanding or the use of force.

There is nothing novel or untried in the first proposition. Arbitration treaties exist between practically all civilized countries. Between some, as United States and Canada, permanent courts have been established to adjudicate differences. To apply this principle to world relations would necessitate a permanent agency to which would be submitted all justiciable differences arising between signatory nations and not susceptible of other adjustment.

Would not a permanent world judicial tribunal composed of jurists and those familiar with international law, with jurisdiction over judicial questions concerning members of the league, be a fitting agency to perform this work?

Fundamentally, would not the creation of this commission for hearing, considering and recommending as to the infinite variety of interests arising between nations, make for the organization of the field and forces of diplomacy? By democratizing the commission and appointing to it those representatives of the rank and file of nations and their varied interests, the light of publicity would be turned upon secret diplomacy and its agents would be rendered more responsive to the will of the people.

Old style diplomacy here failed. The traditional diplomat regarded his service as an art detached from the crude struggle for an existence and was unmindful or ignorant of the human interests involved in machinations of diplomacy. Diplomacy must be made more open, more honest, more effective if our civilization is not to be brought into question and jeopardy.

We suggest consideration of means to make the purpose of the League for Peace effective. Would not those nations that band themselves together in a league for peace need to agree upon means for securing compliance with regulations and for the use of force against a signatory nation which might go to war or engage in hostilities against another member of the league without having submitted its grievances in the proper way provided by the agreement? Joint use of both economic and military forces of signatory nations could be directed against the offending nation.

In order to render international law more tangible and better adapted to the problems with which it must deal would it not be well to provide for conferences of nations to meet at definite times to formulate and codify international law?

In international judicial and justiciable matters there are a large number of problems susceptible to mediation and administrative action. For these we suggest a second agency adapted to deal with matters of an entirely different nature such as economic issues and the affairs concerned in the daily life and work of the citizens of the nations. Such a commission should be composed of men in close touch with industrial and commercial forces in action, not those who from a viewpoint remote from the political and industrial struggle look down upon the activity of the people and the creative forces hewing out the destiny of nations. The real interests, needs and ideals of the people would be best represented by selecting for this commission journalists, publicists, scientists, professional men, men of affairs, wage-earners—those in close touch with the heart of the nations through their work, whether as organizers of the processes of production and commerce or as the human agents necessary for the utilization of material resources.

The suggestions which we submit are to be considered as a general foundation for organization for peace between nations and would help to avert unnecessary wars. We do not declare that it would abolish war—but by mediating the causes of war, war becomes less probable.

We submit for consideration whether each separate nation ought not to maintain its separate agencies for compulsion with the assurance to each of sovereignty and necessary authority to determine matters of a distinctively national character? Collec-

tive action by a league of nations ought not to dictate the limitation or the regulation of military and naval equipment, but it can properly prevent the use of such force for national aggrandizement and for exploitation of the small countries. We deplore militarism but the fight against militarism must ultimately be made by the citizens of the different nations. Establishing methods and agencies which render display of military and naval power no longer effective is the practical and direct way to abolish rivalry between nations in standing armies and naval equipment.

The way to prevent war is to organize for peace.—*American Federationist, December, 1916.*

Our proposal continues as follows:

In addition to these basic principles there should be incorporated in the treaty, which shall constitute the guide of nations in the new period and conditions into which we enter at the close of the war, the following declarations fundamental to the best interests of all nations and of vital importance to wage earners:

That in law and in practice the principle shall be recognized that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce.

Involuntary servitude shall not exist except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.

The right of free association, free assemblage, free speech, and free press shall not be abridged.

That the seamen of the merchant marine shall be guaranteed the right of leaving their vessels when the same are in safe harbor.

No article or commodity shall be shipped or delivered in international commerce in the production of which children under the age of 16 years have been employed or permitted to work.

It shall be declared that the basic workday in industry and commerce shall not exceed eight hours per day.

Trial by jury should be established.

And that is signed by the members of the American Federation of Labor delegation.—*From testimony at hearing before Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, January 3 and 4, 1919.*

Of course the treaty, with the covenant of the League of Nations, is not a perfect instrument. Who expects it? Many peoples of different histories, different traditions, and sometimes conflicting interests, have met together and drafted an agreement by which war shall be made more difficult and perhaps impossible. Shall we turn back? Shall we help to reject this covenant and leave the world in the position where all these people, with their national prejudices, their national hopes and aspirations, may try to be a law unto themselves and can only be checked by the arbitrament of war? I think not. As one delegate at least to this convention, I am not going to play into the hands of politicians and support those who would leave the world open to be inflamed by the horrors of war at any time when any nation feels itself strong enough.

Only a few days ago, for the first time in the history of the world, men left the soil of America and within sixteen hours landed in Europe. What can be done with aeroplanes from America to Europe can be done from Europe to America. We are closer to Europe now than at any time in the history of the world. We cannot now declare, in this age and time, that we shall be isolated and have no alliances with any other peoples. We are so close to them, they are so near to us, that it is essential for us to see to it that the best possible relations are established between the peoples and the governments of our country and all other countries, and to bring about the time by agreement when we shall live in peace. . . .

Never in the history of the world have the nations been confronted with so serious and important a problem as is presented to the men and women of all lands to-day. Here is a serious attempt to prevent international war. Here is an attempt to help the workers, the masses of the people in the most backward countries. Here is a measure which cannot by any stretch of the imagination affect the rights and interests of the workers of the United States, which can in no way curb, prevent or hinder us, every day of every month of every year, from pressing forward the claims of labor for a higher and better life, for more freedom, for more justice, as harbingers of the better day of which poets have sung and philosophers dreamed, and for which the workers have sacrificed and achieved. That is the opportunity presented to the people of our country to-day, and

whether we shall be successful or not depends largely upon the vote of this convention, voicing the sentiments and views of the people whom you represent. Ask the workers, the men who work in the mines, the factories and the workshops anywhere, whether they want to have peace and good will or whether they would throw open further opportunities for a repetition of the world war. Ask them whether they would help in improving the conditions of the workers of other countries when they are assured that their own interests in our own country cannot be impaired, nor their ability checked to fight on and on for that brighter and better day.—*From address in support of the League of Nations, at annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, Atlantic City, N. J., June 20, 1919.*

The world has emerged from the greatest war in history with two main ideas dominating human thought.

The Peace Conference in Paris, therefore, had for its main objects:

1. To prevent future wars, and

2. To improve the world as a place for human habitation through the extension and improvement of democratic self-government.

Former peace treaties have concerned themselves solely with indemnities and boundary lines. Peoples, money and territories have been handed from vanquished to victor about in proportion to the severity of the defeat suffered by the losing nation or nations.

The document brought into being in Paris was built upon new principles. The victorious nations did not set out to see how much territory they could take to themselves from the defeated nations.

A fact of paramount importance in gauging the integrity of the Peace Conference was the fact that millions of people were liberated and set up under independent governments of their own choosing.

The Paris conference sought, as no other peace conference ever has sought, to reach into the mind of the people and write into definite terms the deepest and best thought to be found there.

So it was that the interest of the world's toilers came to be con-

sidered. This was truly an epoch-making step. The covenant of the League of Nations is the written verdict and agreement of the civilized world that until justice is done to those who work, justice has been done only in part.

Not even the most ardent advocate of the League of Nations covenant or of the labor section of the Treaty of Peace will contend that perfection is to be found in it. The Paris conference did not produce a perfect document and did not give a perfect expression to the high ideals that animate the civilized world today.

The conference *did* produce a document that measurably expresses the best and most constructive thought of the world and that opens the way absolutely to a complete expression of the highest ideals which mankind may have and it is for that reason that the complete effort of every forward-looking person should be dedicated to securing ratification of the treaty.

The Treaty of Peace establishes no barrier to progress anywhere.

It opens the way to progress everywhere.

It seeks to clear the way of some of the most hopeless barriers that have held nations enchained in the past and tends to make obsolete the institution of war which has been throughout the history of mankind the most destructive agency it has known. . . .

In the League of Nations is the only safety we know of for the future and the only spiritual recompense we have found for the anguish of the past.—*From pamphlet issued by the American Federation of Labor, July 5, 1919, to organized labor throughout the country, in support of the Treaty of Peace and the League of Nations.*

PEACE AND RECONSTRUCTION

The only result that could in any degree compensate for the present destruction of life would be the coeval destruction of militarism, autocracy, the fetish of the balance of power and the fallacy that political domination must follow industrial relations and control. If the Waterloo that shall close this war shall be the death field for these ghosts that have come down to us from stages of the earlier development of peoples, then some

progress shall have been attained even though the method be cruel, stupid and blundering.

Twentieth century nations must adopt as a principle of government that peace is a basis of all civilization. Peace is not a by-product of other conditions, but it is a condition that can be secured by agents and institutions designed to maintain it. Peace is the fundamental necessity for all government and progress—industrial, intellectual, social and humanitarian. Without peace all these are as nothing. One of the main purposes of governments then must be the maintenance of international peace. —*From Labor Day Address at Plattsburgh, N. Y., September 7, 1914.*

The prosperity and welfare of American labor are largely dependent upon the prosperity and welfare of the American nation. Granted great prosperity to the nation, with a wide margin of profit to the employers, and granted the proper organization of labor for collective bargaining, there is always the chance, at least, to reach justice and equity; but if the United States suffers a serious business reaction, the American employer may have a less margin on which to deal with the problem of wages, and collective bargaining will face an increasingly difficult problem.

All of which means that American labor has far-reaching interests at stake in doing its share to help bring about such a settlement of the present war as will prevent any abnormal reaction upon the prosperity of the United States, and will give the industrial and business interests of the whole world an opportunity to compete along more nearly normal lines.—*From address at convention of the League to Enforce Peace, Washington, D. C., May 26, 1916.*

Another occasion for our offending in the eyes of these self-assumed directors of labor is the failure of the leaders of the American labor movement at the St. Paul Convention to adopt the reconstruction program outlined by the British Labor Party. It would have been more than stupid for the American labor movement to try to impose on this country a program worked out for other institutions and national characteristics. The St. Paul Convention recognized the importance of reconstruction problems and directed the Executive Council to appoint a com-

mittee to study and report upon those problems. What more could the convention do? There would have been no value in turning the convention into a debating society to consider those problems first of all in public. Greater and more satisfactory progress can be made by timely and thoughtful consideration of the problems, careful deliberations on the part of a commission and final consideration and debate before the convention. That is the policy American labor has adopted. It has not ignored reconstruction problems; it is false to say that it is untouched by the higher democratic idealism that is stirring the world to-day. It realizes deeply that the work we are doing to-day will be the basis of organization of to-morrow. No reconstruction program can wholly separate itself from the life of today and the future, but it must be built upon the institutions of the present and in accord with practical principles that have enabled us to make progress from the past.—*American Federationist, August, 1918.*

We give thanks this year in a world fraternity of Liberty. We gaze upon the dawn of the world's most glorious age. We see before us opportunities such as mankind has never faced. Mingled with our profound gratitude for the opportunities now before us is a deep and strong resolve to measure up to those opportunities with all the brain and strength that is in us.

It has cost dearly to set the world free from autocracy. But despite the cost, we are grateful for having had the opportunity to make the good fight, and grateful for the strength and purpose that brought victory to our cause.

There are those who seem uncertain as to what they will do with the liberty that is now theirs. We shall give to them, as we are permitted, our counsel and our material help. Our nation is strong and victorious, but it will consent to use its great strength only for the furtherance of justice. No nation ever had cause to be more sublimely and supremely thankful. Every hour of these momentous days is precious with a great freight of opportunities and we are most deeply appreciative of that fact and thankful for it. We couple our high resolve for the future of humanity with our gratitude for what has been accomplished.—*Statement to the press at Laredo, Texas, November, 1918.*

I would not want any of you, ladies and gentlemen, to imagine that I have in my mind the possibility that leadership can be dispensed with, that leadership carries with it no responsibility, as well as dignity and respect. On the contrary, I believe now more than ever that the men placed in responsible positions and true to the trust reposed in them, deserve the respect and gratitude of a loyal democratic people, and I want to call to the attention of my fellow countrymen the fact, that unless the principles of democracy are practiced in our every day lives we shall, assuredly as the sun rises and sets, lose the power of democracy because we have not used that function in our lives.—*From address at national reception to Mr. Gompers in Chicago, November 8, 1918, under the auspices of The American Alliance for Labor and Democracy.*

It is a wonderful time in which to live, to have lived and done something to achieve that splendid position of our nation and of our people of all classes and walks of life. To me it has been but a larger opportunity for the work of my whole life, for there is nothing that we shall have achieved, nothing that we as a nation will achieve but what was within the limit and the range of the aspirations of the toiling masses as expressed by our labor movement.—*From address before Chamber of Commerce, San Antonio, Texas, November 20, 1918.*

Just before the war, or just after the war was thrust upon us, in conference with my associates of the Committee on Labor of the Council of National Defense, composed of workmen, employers, business men, we formulated a declaration regarding standards during the war. One of the gentlemen of the committee applied an American phrase to the declaration which, though not made a part of it, was quite apropos. It was this: "This is not the time to rock the boat."

That was at the beginning of the war, and to meet the problems of peace I am going to apply that same phrase to the present situation now that the war has practically come to an end. It is not good now to try to rock the industrial boat.

This one fact must be distinctly understood, that the working people of our country who with you and your brothers and sons have made in many instances the supreme sacrifice for victory,

and the men who have given their services in industry and in commerce, are not going easily to take to the proposition to force them back and down in the industrial scale. As has been said, there must be recognition of the condition and situation; each must recognize the principle that as we were united during this tremendous struggle, the most momentous in the history of the world and the most far-reaching in its consequences, so now that peace has come, the problem of working out industrial situations now and for the future must be faced with a spirit of coöperation and coördination. We shall never go back to the old conditions. We have been fighting for a principle of justice. . . .

It is a great privilege to live in this age. It is a great privilege to have helped, even in the slightest, to the great triumph of our arms, of our manhood and womanhood and of the spirit of the people of the republic of the United States. Having been over there, having seen the devastation wrought by the German military machine, and having seen the battle raging during the period that I was privileged to be there; having seen our valiant men, the great generals and the rank and file uniting their spirit, giving and receiving, encouraging; having been upon the battlefield in the front trenches and upon the front ramparts, and within easy firing distance of shot and shell—I say to you, men and women of America, the glory of it, despite the sacrifices of it, will so rejuvenate and regenerate the people of this Republic and make this country of ours so great and glorious that the pages of history of our time will be resplendent in the eyes, in the memories and in the yearnings and gratitude of the generations yet unborn.—*From address at Labor Reconstruction Conference under auspices of the Academy of Political Science, New York City, December 6-7, 1918.*

Some of us have been given great credit, some entirely undue credit for what was done to unite the country in spirit and in action to win the war. That task, large as it was, falls into insignificance as compared to the necessity for unity to meet the problems of peace. . . . It is true that certain advantages have come to the worker by reason of the immediate needs and conditions which have developed during the war. It is not good to give men the opportunity for freedom and then try to take it away from them. It is said that if you want to produce the best

possible children it is best to begin with the grandparents. If you want the people to remain in ignorance and be docile, it is not safe to give them any particle of freedom at all. You can not give freedom to-day, or the opportunity for freedom and expect that the people are going to surrender it without protest. —*From address at meeting of the Council of Foreign Relations, New York City, December 10, 1918.*

Indeed, the problem of how to meet the peace conditions is greater than the problem which confronted us in meeting the conditions of war. In war, when the red blood of man is easily warmed, he is interested, and he is not difficult to attract. We have had more volunteer service in this war than it was dreamed possible at any time, or by any man, and coming from men and women in all walks of life. The patriotism of our people was not confined to any class, group, or caste. While I do know that in some instances, and in too many instances, some of the activities were put forth for private profiteering, as a rule I have not any hesitancy in saying that the voluntary patriotic and practical service given by the men and women of the United States was such as I never dreamed or hoped to live to see. It was a revelation to find men in the humblest walks of life gladly giving and doing anything, the men and women of labor giving every ounce of energy that was in them, and bearing under it all with a feeling of willingness to sacrifice anything, men giving up their boys in a manner which was almost unbelievable. . . . The problems of war are sensational; that problem is one of activity and one which arouses the people to action at once. The problem of peace, with its poverty and its misery and possible degradation, only touches the conscience and the judgment and the action of the thinking men and women, of the men who want to do and who are not aroused purely by sensations, but by the consciousness of doing the right thing, the moral duty of prevention of disease, of fire, of war, of hunger.—*From testimony at hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, January 3 and 4, 1919.*

I have been asked whether I believe that the business men, the employers, have given faithful service to the cause. I wouldn't say anything here that I wouldn't say on the housetops. There

have been, I know, some employers and business men whose first, last and only thought was profits, profits, profits. I do know, too, that the great majority of the men and women of affairs of our country have given loyal, unselfish and patriotic service in and during this war. My only regret is that some of them are breaking away, acting upon the idea that now that the war is over their duty is done. You can arouse people's interest when something sensational is going on. The difficulty is to keep their interest in matters that are not sensational, when problems are to be met to which only the few will give their attention and try to solve, or concern themselves with new situations, new ideas, new life. My friends, it is well that we should come in council with each other and look all the problems squarely in the face. Don't flinch, don't run away from the job. It must be done. Either you will deal with rational men of a constructive turn of mind and character, who aim to live the lives of free men and free women and to work out a better life here and now, or you will have another and a different element with which to cope, or they with you, and no one can tell what the results will be. I am not an alarmist. Speaking frankly and freely, if I believed for one moment that the work of the American labor movement was ineffective, that it was within the power of employers either as individuals or associations to destroy that movement, to make it impossible for us to bring more of happiness and well-being and hope into the lives of the men and women who work for wages, I would join with any movement that promised something of betterment for the toiling masses of our country.—*From address on board SS. "Carmania," January 10, 1919.*

Upon you, men, much will devolve in the near future. You have the constructive work of safeguarding American manhood and womanhood and childhood, of working out our problems to meet situations such as we find in some countries which we have just left. Radicalism, so-called—perhaps insanity would be a better description of what I now refer to—is rampant, and it has its propagandists, its organization, just as active now as was the pacifist and German militarist propaganda of a few short months ago. Only a few days ago, right on this ship, there was delivered an address, subtle, able, the purport of which was the indirect propagation of this pernicious thought of Bolshevism. Men of

America, soldiers of America, upon you will devolve the great responsibility of the future. You are young men. Men of my time and my years will pass away, and perhaps pass away soon, and it will be for you to develop the spirit of the new America, to hold yourselves well in hand in the conduct of your industrial or commercial pursuits, to see to it that there is a middle ground of safety, to use your great influence as men who have been in the fighting ranks, that America, fair America, shall have her chance for development and growth, that right shall prevail, that justice shall obtain, that the children of to-day who grow up into manhood and womanhood of the future may carry on this great scheme of freedom and justice, under the flag, and to see to it that the poisonous fangs of Bolshevism and rowdyism shall be stamped out of our country. . . .

There are two kinds of enemies to human progress now rampant in the United States as well as in other countries. One is known as Bolshevism and the other as standpatism. They are the twin dangers which menace the civilization of our time. I want you, my fellow-passengers, to understand me quite clearly for I have nothing to hide. I am not against Bolshevism simply because of its name; I am not against Bolshevism simply because it declares a tyranny of the proletariat. I am against Bolshevism because it means the subversion of our civilization for a century or more if it shall triumph. I am equally opposed, with all the emphasis of my being, to the standpatter who weighs human labor upon the same scale that he does a ton of coal or a side of pork. . . .

Among the great painters was one who depicted a laborer commonly known and made famous as the "Man with the Hoe," the man with bent back and receding forehead, with all the wrongs of the ages written upon his countenance and all his resentment expressed in his features. If this war has meant anything it has given us a new concept; these thoughts must be set aside and a new standard erected. The worker is a man or woman. The worker is no longer leaning forward with bent back nor is his forehead receding. There is no resentment in his features or in his heart, but he demands from modern society the new concept that he be regarded not only as a producer, not only as a worker, but as a fellow-man and fellow-citizen insistent upon every right of his citizenship and manhood.—*From address on Steamship "Rotterdam," April 8, 1919.*

We have fought and won a great war for a noble cause. Americans cannot be less devoted to that cause than they were six months ago and a year ago. There must be in every American heart the same fervor for the cause of America that there was when the cause was in danger. The cause is safe to-day. The might of our nation in arms made it safe. This fact has a great meaning to every American, whatever his work or place may be. I believe the great mass of working men and women will especially feel the truth of this.

There remains to us the task of paying some of the costs of our magnificent effort. We ought to rejoice deeply that the cost is so low and that it may be paid in money instead of lives.

I appeal to my fellow Americans, and especially to my fellow American workers, to help pay this remaining cost—to help gladly and freely. It is a solemn but happy duty that is laid upon each of us to buy the bonds of this last great loan, this loan of victory for freedom and democracy. Let us buy as we would buy if we were standing in Belleau Wood. Let us buy as we would buy if we were beholding with our eyes the great sacrifice for liberty that our own home folk made there.—*From press statement, April 28, 1919.*

When we emerged from the war there were men who, perhaps unthinkingly, set up cries in our country for the reduction of wages. They saw only one thing—reduction of production costs. They did not see the whole world problem as an entity. They saw their corner of it—and they spoke quickly.

Whatever may have been their intent, their action, if it were permitted to become action, would furnish the richest food Bolshevism could ask for in America. The world was not saved for misery, but for light and life. Reduction of wages has never led a people toward light and life. Always it has led toward panic and hunger and ill-considered action.

We have come forward toward light and life through such measures as the Clayton Law which declares that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce; and the seamen's law which makes the seaman free from the bondage of earlier days. We have succeeded in establishing a concept in law and in administration that the welfare of the workers is a matter of paramount interest. In this direction we must go,

for this direction is forward and any other must be backward. American labor does not necessarily ask for more law. Our movement has never sought a wealth of law, it has asked only such law as is needed to clear the path to progress. The great task has been to secure the removal of law that blocked that path. . . .

There is a tendency in the world to-day to say that everything of a forward-looking nature with which one disagrees is Bolshevism. It has become almost a habit to use that term loosely. But there is a just ambition for a higher standard of life and living that is not Bolshevism and that will not be denied, except at the imminent peril of those who deny, if they prove themselves strong enough to deny with compelling force. The safety of the world to-day—and I say this as one who loves with deep passion the institutions of our own nation and of all democratic peoples—lies in an orderly advancement toward better lives for working people everywhere. . . .—*From "The Battle Line of Labor," McClure's Magazine, May, 1919.*

Soldiers and sailors, those who entered the service in the nation's defense, are entitled to the generous reward of a grateful Republic.

The necessities of war called upon millions of workmen to leave their positions in industry and commerce to defend, upon the battle fields, the nation's safety and its free institutions. These defenders are now returning. It is advisable that they should be discharged from military service at the earliest possible moment; that as civilians they may return to their respective homes and families and take up their peace-time pursuits. The nation stands morally obligated to assist them in securing employment.

Industry has undergone great changes due to the dislocation caused by war production and transportation. Further readjustments in industry and commerce must follow the rehabilitation of business under peaceful conditions. Many positions which our citizen soldiers and sailors filled previous to enlistment do not exist to-day.

It would be manifestly unjust for the government after having removed the worker from his position in industry and placed him in military service to discharge him from the army or navy

without having made adequate provision to assist him in procuring employment and providing sustenance until employment has been secured. The returned citizen soldier or sailor should not be forced by the bitter urgent necessity of securing food and clothing to place himself at a disadvantage when seeking employment.

Upon their discharge, transportation and meals should be supplied, to their places of residence. The monthly salary previously paid should be continued for a period not to exceed twelve months if employment is not secured within that period.

The federal and state employment bureaus should be directed to coöperate with trade union agencies in securing employment for discharged soldiers and sailors. In assisting the discharged soldier and sailor to secure employment, government agencies should not expect them to accept employment for less than the prevailing rate of wages being paid in the industry. Neither should any government agency request or require such discharged men to accept employment where a trade dispute exists or is threatened. Nor should the refusal on the part of any of these discharged soldiers or sailors to accept employment where trade disputes exist or are threatened or when less than the prevailing rate is offered, deprive them of a continuance of their monthly pay.

Legislation also should be enacted which will give the nation's defenders the opportunity for easy and ready access to the land. Favorable inducements should be provided for them to enter agriculture and husbandry. The government should assume the responsibility for the allotment of such lands, and supply the necessary capital for its development and cultivation, with such safeguards as will protect both the government and the discharged soldier and sailor.—*From Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlantic City, N. J., June, 1919.*

The Treaty of Peace formulated in Paris acknowledges the complete justice of the five points set forth by the Buffalo Convention and reaffirmed at St. Paul, which are based upon declarations of the President of the United States, and contains two of the four propositions added at St. Paul. Thus is justified the high confidence felt by the American labor movement and expressed in these declarations that the result of the world war

would be to place the conduct and morals of the governments of the world upon a higher plane and the establishment and maintenance of international relations which shall safeguard the peoples of the world in the enjoyment of a permanent peace.

The Treaty of Peace as drafted by the allied and associated governments sets a new standard in the relation of nation to nation and gives to government a purpose that has been lacking where the monarchical and bureaucratic concept obtained. The Prussian idea, defeated on the field of battle, is now forever made impossible of revival by the Treaty of Peace submitted to the German envoys.

The five guiding principles laid down at the Buffalo Convention of the American Federation of Labor as basic principles of a lasting peace are firmly imbedded in the draft and we feel that with a peace so built the world has in truth been made safe for democracy. Under the guiding principles now laid down as the standard of conduct for all nations the peoples of the world may go forward in security and freedom to work out their own concepts of democracy and their own ideals of freedom.

The Covenant of the League of Nations, written into the Treaty of Peace, must meet with the unqualified approval and support of the American working people. It is not a perfect document and perfection is not claimed for it. It does, however, mark the nearest approach to perfection that ever yet has been reached in the international affairs of mankind. It provides the best machinery yet devised for the prevention of war. It places human relations upon a new basis and endeavors to enthrone right and justice instead of strength and might as the arbiters of international destinies.

It is, we feel, well to recall the adoption of the Constitution by our own federal government in the early days of its life. Perhaps no document in the history of the world was more attacked, criticized and opposed than was the Constitution of the United States when it was first formulated and adopted by the Congress. On several occasions that Constitution has been amended, yet no one would presume to say, because of these amendments, that the Constitution was not good when it was adopted, or is not good to-day.

Opportunity is afforded for amendments to the covenant of the League of Nations in order that the human family may from

time to time make such improvements as may be needed and may so readjust its guiding rules of conduct as to make for the highest good of all the world. We declare our endorsement of the triumph of freedom and justice and democracy as exemplified in the covenant of the League of Nations.

The introduction of the nine specific labor clauses in the Peace Treaty declares that "the well-being, physical and moral, of the industrial wage earners is of supreme international importance."

No such declaration has ever been written into international law through any previous treaty of peace and it is due to the efforts of the American labor movement more than to any other single factor that it appears in this emphatic form in the present treaty.

The labor section of the treaty as it appears in its final form is, of course, a compromise. It must, however, be a source of deepest satisfaction to the American working people to know that the American position and American declarations as presented for insertion in the treaty ranked above all others in point of progress measured and in point of actual and practical application in the lives of working people. Whatever of compromise appears, was made because of the claim that other nations of the world could not pledge themselves to an immediate and definite acceptance of the standards maintained by the American labor movement as the established practices of our day.—*From Report to A. F. of L. Convention, Atlantic City, N. J., June, 1919.*

The launching of this ship, bearing the name of labor's most highly developed organization, the American Federation of Labor, —its abbreviation "*Afel,*"—with all the magnificence and panoply attending the occasion,—can you imagine what it means to me? To me, who in the early days of our movement have had not only a deaf ear turned by the workers themselves, but the condemnation and abuse of all those who ground men to the earth, who worked against and looked upon our organizations of labor as if they were the combination of all the devils incarnate? Can you imagine what it meant to me to-day to find, under the auspices of the Government of the United States, and in the plant of a great industrial corporation, the coöperation of all these elements with the men and the women who not only built that ship but all its sister ships, who not only built them but gave them

their souls, their patriotic service, and made their sacrifices in this cause of ours? I have lived the time when hostile interests would have sent me, not only to jail but to the gallows. There has not been any change in me. The things which I believed then I believe now, and am fighting for to-day as then. The change has not been in our movement. It has been the opportunity of understanding what we are striving for, that changed the judgment of our opponents and our enemies. This day means to me so much, for we have given industrially the fullest measure of our strength, physical and mental, in the greatest struggle in human history, and now our work and our sacrifice and our service are beginning to be appreciated. And on this very day, the signing of the Treaty of Peace that shall end the wars of the world, accompanies this recognition and appreciation of labor, ushering in a new era of justice and freedom, of peace and democracy, for the peoples of all the world.—*From address at banquet at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., June 28, 1919, following the launching of the ship "Afel," at Hog Island.*

We took four million men out of the ranks of industry and labor and put them into the camps and the battlefields of Europe. These men have been brought back to the number of two million and a half. There are about a half million yet to come back. Machinery—the best in the world—has been put into industry during the war to produce quantities of supplies and ammunition, and things never dreamed of in the world's history. I want to ask every man and woman here to consult their own minds and consciences and ask themselves whether it is not our first duty to find jobs and work for the men who were willing to give up their lives in order to make this country secure and to give the people of the allied countries the opportunity to live their own lives? The first duty we owe is to see to it that in these trying hours we shall so re-arrange and re-adjust our affairs that the American workingman shall have the right to a job before anyone who may want to come here from another country. . . . I would not want any man to believe that I want to build a Chinese wall around the United States. . . . If the workers of all countries were well organized and had established standards of life and labor commensurate or nearly commensurate with the

life and standards established here, there could be no objection. The doors would be thrown open and the hand of welcome extended to all who come of their own volition. . . . But this is a crucial time—an unprecedented time in America, and it simply means that for the time being we must protect ourselves or be overwhelmed.—*From address before Pan-American Federation of Labor Congress, at the Hotel Continental, New York City, July, 1919.*

The circumstances of the past five years have drawn the peoples closer together and brought the nations to the situation where their interests are more closely woven together. Entirely aside from the question of whatever may be the wishes of peoples, the circumstances are such that no people can lead a life unto itself. The future of all is woven into one future. Not only did the war draw us together in response to a common sentiment and a common idealism, but it brought us closer together by a more intricate weaving of the industrial life that forms so great a part of the fabric of our civilization. The working people of England and America, I am sure, have no regrets because of this. Almost all that the people of our two countries have is the heritage of a common ancestry and a common background.

It must be apparent to all that the organized labor movements of both countries appreciate this to the fullest extent. The hopes and aspirations of the labor movements of our two countries are substantially the same. While different conditions may require different manifestations of policy and tactics, the central thought in the minds of us all, on whichever side of the Atlantic we may be, is that our common future must be worked out and reached through the ordered processes of democracy. I think we feel in common that we shall make progress toward a better day in proportion as we take advantage of the opportunities democracy offers us for consistent and intelligently ordered advancement.

It is in the minds of men everywhere to-day that the human race must go forward. There are those influences in both our nations which have in mind only a picture of the past. That, it is clear, is a picture that is not in the minds of the organized workers of either Great Britain or America. Our picture is one of the future, perhaps not altogether clear in outline but being

molded into form by the realization every day of a certain measure of progress toward the final goal.

All that Great Britain had and all that America had was staked upon the struggle against political autocracy. These great resources were thrown into the fight for a definite thing and that definite thing was democracy. What we struggled for has been achieved. If that struggle has had any meaning and if the outcome has any meaning, it is that we are committed with all of our intelligence and all of our thought and all of our reasonings to the principle of democracy. We are committed together to go into the future, to work out our salvation through the ways and opportunities of democracy, and I speak with confidence when I express the hope and the belief that through these ways and these opportunities we shall justify the sacrifices that have been made and mold in the future a civilization founded upon political and industrial justice.

There are trying times ahead. It is not too much to say that there are times ahead that will try us more severely than we have ever yet been tried. Our best common judgment will be required to meet the issues that we face, but the great English-speaking nations will meet every emergency and will prove equal to every demand. The organized labor movements of both our nations occupy positions of great and grave responsibility enlarged and accentuated by the war. They will contribute to the full in the tremendous work that is to come; they will justify their positions and more. With the shaping of the future of the world undoubtedly largely in the hands of the two great English-speaking nations and in view of conditions everywhere the responsibility that lies between us overshadows and outweighs that laid upon the people of any other country. It behooves us to have full realization of this and to undertake every task in a spirit of the most sober and mature judgment. The common counsel that we take together will be in the interest of mankind. The common progress that we make will be for the betterment of the world. No peoples at any time ever had a larger responsibility and a more glorious opportunity.—*Independence Day statement for the "London Times," July 4, 1919.*

INDEX

A

American Alliance for Labor and Democracy....253
American Federation of Labor—
and Clayton antitrust act....77
composition of....30
"conservatism" of....139
and the European War....247-249
evolution of....90
and freedom of petition for Post Office employees....47-48
and independent labor party....123
and individual voters....141
influence of....21
and injunctions....70
and inter-allied labor conference....238-239
and the "intellectuals"....35
and international labor conference with enemy participation....233-235, 238-239, 259, 263-264
and partisan politics....142-143
and Peace Treaty....287-288
and political campaign expenses....141
and political representation in A. F. of L. conventions....124
political policy....142-143, 145-146
(*See also* American labor movement; organized labor; trade unions.)
and reforms....20
and seamen's legislation....167-169
and socialists....180-184
and trade union autonomy....124
and tuberculosis....116
"Afol," launching of....289-290
A. F. of L. Building....172-173
American flag....211, 216
American institutions—
and self-government....211
superiority....157-158
American labor movement—
and peace....239
and preparedness....244-245
militancy of....241
war demands....262
American Labor Union....177-181
American Red Cross....260-261
American Society of Equity....40

Army, The—
large standing army....246
citizen soldiery....246
soldier control of....254-255

B

Berger, Victor L., on revolution....188
Brewer, Justice, injunctions....70, 71
British Labor and the War....267-268
British labor party, reconstruction program....278-279
British trades disputes act....67-68, 140
British trade unions....1, 4
British trade unionists, methods....140
Brotherhood of man....288
Brown, John....63
Burleson idea....57
Business men and the War....282-283
Bolshevism—
principles....207, 209
French socialist party endorses....207-208
dictatorship of the proletariat....209
menace of....283-284, 286
Boycott....75

C

Capital....11
Capitalist system, evolution....90
Charity workers....29, 30, 33
Chicago Daily Socialist....38
Child labor....129
Chinese exclusion....129
Church, the....31, 32
Cigarmakers, working conditions, wages, strikes....147-148
Cigarmakers' International Union, average length of lives of members....171-172
Clayton antitrust act....77, 169, 285
Classes....33, 44
Class legislation....52-53
Class struggle....9
Collective bargaining—
advantages of....12
influence of national prosperity upon....278
Commodities and human labor power....4, 5, 10, 14, 16, 144-145
Competition....17
Congress, United States—
functions and power of....46, 47
House of Representatives, functions....51, 52
opposed to labor....130-131, 132-138
refuses to enact labor legislation....46, 47
trade union men in....177
Conscientious objectors....232

Conscription—
employers' use of against labor 250
and soldiers' and sailors' dependents.....249
Constitution, United States.....48, 49
Consumers—
vs. producers.....91
and the trusts.....92, 93
Consumers' leagues.....32
Contempt of court.....70-72
Convict labor—
in Minnesota state prison.....95-96
labor exploiters favor.....110
convict contract labor system—
character, robs prisoners.....110-111
operation in Missouri.....111
results in Maryland.....111, 112-113
convicts not taught trades.....111
states must employ convicts direct.....111-112
profits of contractors.....111
interstate shipment of convict goods.....112
details of the system.....114-115
trade union attitude toward.....127
Courts, The—
anti-labor decisions and injunctions.....134
illegality of lower court decrees.....76
and injunctions.....61-62
labor's criticism of.....73
opposition to labor organizations.....73
and the people.....73
restricts freedom of the press.....76
and labor provisions of Clayton antitrust act.....76
and rights.....53
and rights of the workers.....58-59
and strikes.....61-62
usurpation of legislative power by.....73-74
Criminal code, court made.....77
Cuba—
organized labor demands liberty for.....129-130
A. F. of L. demands recognition of.....224
conditions under Spanish rule.....224
independence of.....225

D

Danbury hatters' case.....47, 134
Debs, Eugene V.....181, 182, 187
Declaration of Independence.....50, 173
Demobilization 286-287
Democracy—
and everyday life.....280
and the labor movement.....195, 218, 258-259
and preparedness.....243-244
and Prussian militarism.....256-257
and standing armies.....246

Democratic party, attitude toward labor's demands.....137-138
Department of Labor.....142
Direct action.....203-204
Disarmament.....220-221, 245
Discontent.....2
Discussion.....131-132
Distribution of wealth.....9, 94, 152, 185, 195
Division of labor.....101
Dred Scott decision.....63

E

Economic action.....55, 56
Economic conditions, 1902-1916.....170-171
Economic conditions, American *vs.* European.....151
Economic development.....157-159
Economic power.....55, 56, 59, 60
Education.....43, 101, 105-106, 164
Education, industrial.....101-107
Eight-hour day—
  achievements of organized labor.....127
  eight-hour law.....46
  influence of.....124
  on Panama Canal.....133
  origin and extension of.....165-166
  (See also Volume II., "Labor and the Employer")
Eliot, Dr.....17
Employers and the labor movement.....283
European War—
  and anti-labor government administration.....216-217
  and brotherhood of man.....228
  causes.....268-269
  and democracy.....261
  and immediate peace.....254
  and national unity.....253-254
  and patriotism.....214
  power of Congress to declare.....251-252
  principles and institutions at stake.....262
  problems of production.....258
  referendum on declaration of war.....252
  war economy.....266-267
  war finance.....265-266
  war risk insurance.....269-270
  war service.....255-256

F

Farmers.....40
Farmers' Educational and Coöperative Union.....30, 41
Federal jurisdiction.....49
Federal system.....21, 157
Finance, place of in industry.....93
"First American Conference for Democracy and Terms of Peace"..249
Freedom.....2, 211-212
Freight-handlers, conditions and wages.....148-149
Free assemblage.....7, 72, 108-109
Free association.....72

Free press....14, 68, 72
Free speech....14, 68, 72, 108-109, 134
French Government, dissolves teachers' union....96
Fundamental rights....57, 58

G

Germany—
free assembly and free speech....267-268
German army....240
German government....264-265, 266
German socialists....236
German socialists support the war....263
the Lusitania sinking....235
menace to Russia....260
organized labor has no influence upon German government....267
"peace" offensives....236
President Wilson's fourteen points....236
Prussian militarism....256-257
General strike....202
Gladstone, W. E....11, 48
Government ownership....95-99
Government workers....45, 48, 57, 99-100
Great Britain—
and the United States....291-292
political policy of organized labor....125
Guardians of labor....34, 35, 36

H

Hague Conference....219-220
Harlan, Justice, usurpation of legislative power by courts....73-74
Hawaii, slavery abolished by trade unions....128
Haywood, W. D., on violence....187-188
Health, industrial conditions for....118-120
Henry, Patrick....59
Heroism....212-213, 216-217
Home market....151
Hunter, Robert....183
Hillquit, Morris....184

I

Idealism....203
Illiteracy....105-106
Imperialism....211
Independent political action....125-126
Independent political labor party....140-146
Industrial conditions....12
Industrial crises....14
Industrial liberty....45, 46
Industrial panic....151
Industrial relations....4, 45
Industries, private, regulation of....154-155
Industrial Unionism....183
(*See also* One Big Union.)
Industrial Workers of the World....182, 197-206
Ingraham, Dr....11

Immigration—
Chinese exclusion....81-85
contract labor....78-79, 85-86
employers....87
European economic conditions....82
foreign schools....88
immigrants....44
induced....78, 80, 88
labor standards....88
literacy test....81-82, 88
post-war restriction....290-291
"servants"....80
Injunctions—
class character....66-67
and conspiracies....75
and free assemblage and association....72
and freedom of press and speech....68-70
and industrial relations....75
and jail sentences....64
and municipal council investigation....70-71
number petitioned for by employers 1898-1908....74
and patriotism of workers....215-216
power to issue....66
abuse of....66
procedure *vs.* criminal law....69-70
and property rights....72
and riots....65
and strikes....61, 63-65
temporary....63
"Intellectuals"....18, 31, 33, 34, 35
Inter-allied labor conference (war-time)....238-239
International court of arbitration....226
International labor conference (war-time) with enemy representation....233-235, 238-239
International labor relations—
and trade unions....221
influence of organized labor upon....218-219
International peace—
abolition of war....270
at any price....239
arbitration....272
armed peace....271
and disarmament....226-227
essential labor demands to insure....274
governments....277-278
international complications....273-274
league for peace....271-274
league of nations....275-276
old style diplomacy....272
and organized force....214-215
and organized labor....219, 220, 226
International relations—
Anglo-Saxon....291-292
and diplomacy....214
Interstate Commerce law....45

International Socialist Review....38
Involuntary servitude—
Hawaii....152-153
Seamen....167-168
"Isms"....7, 18
Italy—
German peace propaganda....236
Italian workers and the war....269
Socialists' anti-war propaganda in....237-238
War unity....237-238

J

Jewish workers....43

K

Kirby, John....38
Knights of Labor....12

L

Labor—
dignity of....170
hand, factory, machine....6
Labor Day....31
Labor legislation....8, 46, 47, 55
Labor movement....7, 13, 23, 34, 35
Labor power, human—not a commodity....169, 274
Labor representation in industry....55-56
Labor standards—
and immigration....290-291
organized labor's position....280-281
"Labor war"....163
Land settlement....287
Law as a panacea....53, 54
Law of supply and demand....14, 15
Legislation—
by injunction....66
labor legislation sought by workers....55
Legislative action....53, 54, 55, 56
Leadership....280
League of Nations....275-277, 288, 289
Legien, Carl....267
Leisure....169-170
Leroy, Prof....10
Liberty—
danger to in United States....58-59
loss of in Rome....58
Lien laws secured by trade unions....128
Lincoln, President, on strikes....10
Lock-outs....76
Loyalty of American labor....218
Low, Seth....38, 40
Lusitania, sinking of....235-236

M

McNamara Case....186-187
Marx, Karl—
theories....185-186
on violence....189
philosophy of....192
Massachusetts, bureau of labor statistics....129
Mexico....221-222
Militarism—
in Germany....240
the militia....239-240
opposition of trade union movement to....246
protection against....241
Prussian....256-257, 260
Military camps....241
Military training....241
Militia, used against workers....239-240, 247
Milwaukee Democratic Herald....38
Mill and mine conditions—
Breaker boys....128
inspection....129
Safety appliances....128-129
safety in mines, United States....143-154
Misery....7
Mitchell, John....38
Modern industry....1, 101
Municipal ownership—
effect upon trade unions....96-97
of street car system in Detroit, defeated by trade unions....99

N

National Association of Builders....11
National Association of Manufacturers....37, 38
National Civic Federation, The....26, 36, 37, 38, 39
National defense....241-245
National resources, conservation of....121-122
National unity....280-281
Neutrality—
and sale of war supplies....231-232
and strikes....226-227
New Republic, The....36, 142
New South Wales, state regulation of industrial relations....195
New York Call....38, 189
New York Volkszeitung....38
New York Vorwaerts....38
Non-resistance....229-230, 232

O

One big union....12, 183
Organized labor—
and cheap labor....103
and child labor....153

Organized labor—
and congressional opposition to labor....130-131
and Cuban independence....223-224
and concentrated wealth....159
and contract prison labor system....113-114
and the Declaration of Independence....154
and economic development....158-159
economic platform....165
and economic problems....160
and education....105
establishes first public school in Massachusetts....103
and the European War....215
and home life....161
and industrial education....103-104
and the Industrial Workers of the World....196-198
and international labor relations....218-219
and international socialist conference at Stockholm....231
and large *vs.* small employers....91
and millionaires....154
and mine conditions....153-154
pledge in peace or in war....247-249
and political corruption....161
and political parties....215
and revolution....150
and progress....162-163
and social evolution....152
and socialist war-time internationalism....236-237
and trust smashing....92
and unorganized workers....156-157
and war-time strikes....250-251
(*See also* American Federation of Labor; American labor movement; trade unions.)

P

Pacifism....229-230
Pan-American Federation of Labor, jurisdiction, autonomy of national unions....222-223
Patriotism—
and the European war....214
meaning of American institutions....211-212
of organized wage earners....212-213, 217-218
of American people....282
Peace Conference—
labor representation in....266-267
main objects....276-277
Peace Terms....258, 261
Peace Treaty—
includes demands of American labor....287-289
labor section....277, 289-290
main objects....276
Philanthropy....16
Phillips, Wendell....11
Plasterers, economic conditions....167
Political action, power, rights—
address of organized labor and farmers to the country....135-136

Political action, power, rights—
dangers of the political field....139
effective use of political power....138-139
labor's bill of grievances....130-138
labor's protest conference....135
labor's protest to Congress....135-136
significance of....8
trade union political action, achievements....127-130
Political economists....4, 33
Porto Rico, conspiracy laws abolished by organized labor....128
Post, C. W....37, 38
Post Office Department....48, 49
Poverty and trade unions....2
Preparedness—
co-operation of the workers....248-249
and democracy....243-244
economic....242-243
and militarism....242
policies....240-241
and wage-earners....244-245
Prices....171
Prisons, conditions, reform....113-114
Producers....91
Profiteering....250, 282, 283
Progress, influence of organized labor....162-163
Prosperity....94-95, 278
Public rights....25, 26, 27
Public schools—
established in Massachusetts by organized labor....103
give one-sided education....102
and industrial education....101-105
labor....103
must be unrestricted....101
superior to European schools....158

R

Radicalism....283-284
Reconstruction problems—
Bolshevism....283-284, 286
demobilization....286-287
democracy....291-292
immigration....290-291
land settlement....287
unemployment....287
wage reductions....285-286
Reconstruction programs—
British Labor Party....278-279
American Federation of Labor....278-279
Referendum—
on Declaration of War....252
on sinking of Lusitania....252-253
Rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors....256
Republican party, attitude toward labor....137
Revolution....150

Right of petition....48, 57
Rogers, Thorold....11
Roman people....59
Roosevelt, President....66
Ruling class....7
Russia—
American labor's message to Russian people....260
discontent caused by tyranny....13-14
Greeting to Russian democracy by American Alliance for Labor and Democracy....253
Menaced by Prussian militarism....260
Russian Bolsheviki....267
Russian revolution....207-208

S

Sabotage....203-204
Seamen—
liberated by the A. F. of L....129
seamen's bill....167-169
Sherman anti-trust law....45, 52
Serfdom....151
Simons, A. M....187
Slavery....13, 151
Socialism—
and liberty....194-195
menace of....191-192
parliamentary socialism....220
philosophy of....179-180
practical socialism in Europe....191
socialist *vs.* trade union procedure for protection of constitutional rights....193-194
Socialists—
aim at physical force revolution through destruction of trade unions....180
are unreasonable....37
attempts to dominate trade union movement....180-184
and boycotting union cigarmakers....178
compared with capitalist enemies of trade unions....189-190
and constitutional rights....193-194
and the co-operative commonwealth....195
and economic problems....176
and the European War....236-237
French Socialists on Bolshevism....207-208
German socialists....184
and "Gomperism"....193
influence in trade unions....3
and Labor Day....177-178
not real trade unionists....190
and property....176-177
and reforms....184
and strikes....175
and trade unions....175
and trade union candidates for public office....177
on violence and the McNamara case....186-187

Socialists and the European War—
France 207-208
Germany 263
Italy 237-238
United States 263
Social justice 22
Social progress 151
Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance 181
Soldiers and sailors—
demobilization 286-287
dependents 249-250
employment for 287, 290
land settlement 287
Spanish-American War 223-225
Square Deal, The 38
Standpatism 284
State, The—
police power of 112
policies directed by organization 45
represents wealth owners 90
State jurisdiction 49
State Socialism 182
Stockholm Conference (socialist)—
A. F. of L. refuses to attend 231
called by pro-Kaiser interests 230-231
Stowe, Lyman Beecher 113
Street-car employees, wages, conditions 149
Strikes—
cigarmakers' 148
of government employees 57
illegal 267-268
in New South Wales 195
I. W. W. attitude toward 197-198
lawful 75
Lincoln's opinion 10
and neutrality 227-228
and the "public" 25-26
right of minority to oppose 251
right to strike 59-62
socialist attitude toward 175
strike breakers 155
war-time strikes 250-251, 264-265
Supreme Court, United States—
character of 63
Dred Scott decision 67
Syndicalism 200-201
Sunday labor 31

T

Taff-Vale decision 52, 140
Tailoresses, hours, wages 149-150
Teachers—
French government dissolves teachers' union 96

Theoreticians 23
Trade Unions—
achievements.....127-130, 166, 176, 179-180
action 8
and boycotts.....75
control of members' political activity.....132
and control of property.....94-95
and conservatism.....2
and the courts.....75-76
and court decrees.....75-76
and distribution of wealth.....59
and education.....1, 2, 42, 43
effectiveness of.....19
and eight-hour laws.....59-60
evolution of.....60
exclusively of wage earners.....30, 31
and "fixed programs".....21-22
and freedom.....2
freedom of.....18, 19
functions of.....1, 6
and fundamental rights.....74
idealism of.....154-155
and immigration.....44, 78-88, 290-291
and independent political action.....125
and international labor unity.....221
and large standing army.....246
and legislation.....124
and lock-outs.....76
and membership in the militia.....239-240
methods 23, 205
mission of.....9
"narrowness" of.....18, 19
and non-unionists.....16-17
not trusts.....15
opposition to.....11, 23, 24
and picketing.....76
and political rights.....20
and poverty.....1, 2
and practical democracy.....20
primary objects.....20
primary school.....42
pure and simple.....3
and radical movements.....175
recognition of.....26
and rights.....1
and socialists.....3
and strikes.....61-62, 75-76
and trial by jury.....76
voluntary associations.....15
(*See also* American Federation of Labor; American labor movement; organized labor.)
Trade union wreckers.....24
Trusts.....15, 16, 81-95
Tuberculosis 115-117

U

Unemployment 151
Union label 30, 32, 41
United Brotherhood of Builders of America 198
United Hebrew Trades 43
United States Government 50, 51, 174, 267

V

Violence 186-189, 203
Voluntary associations 15

W

Wages 14, 24, 25, 27
Wages and prices 171
Wage reductions 14, 285-286
Wage system 3
Wage workers, progress of 7
Wage-earning class 8
Walling, William English 184
War—
  abolition of 270
  brutality of 229-230
  and democracy 233
  and disarmament 226
  and militarism 245
  and strikes 227-228
  and the working class 219-220, 225-226, 228, 239, 270
Wealth, concentrated 12
Welfare workers 33
Wilson, President—
  German-Austrian attitude toward 236
  program for world peace 258
  supported by inter-allied labor movements 261
Woman suffrage—
  supported by organized labor 107
  will not solve industrial problems 108
World labor conference coincident with official peace conference 266-267
Work 13
Workers and the State 90
Wright, Justice 71-72

Date Due

N 12 '42			
[illegible] 2 '48			
MR 16 '50			
DEC [illegible] '68			
[illegible] '68			
NOV [illegible] '84			

HD8072 .G63
Labor and the common welfare,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 1332